Kissinger Commission Report: drugs and mass depopulation

by Gretchen Small

From the standpoint of the Soviet Union, it would be a major strategic coup to impose on the U.S. the burden of defending our southern approaches . . . to divert U.S. attention and resources from other parts of the world that are of greater importance to Moscow.

—Kissinger Commission Report

I cannot support or approve the Report's findings . . . Military aid to the Salvadoran Government has not been effective. The military aid has been a source of arms for the guerrillas themselves . . . The increase in military aid to El Salvador could continue to be a focus of violence not only for this country, but for all Central America.

—President Miguel de la Madrid of Mexico

With Henry Kissinger and Averell Harriman on the scene, it is hard to be a friend or ally of the United States these days.

The Report of the National Bipartisan Commission on Central America, more commonly known as the Kissinger Commission, is one of the most immoral, lying, fraudulent policy proposals in many years. It is a blueprint for disaster, to which are affixed the names of leading figures of the Eastern Establishment—Democrat and Republican alike.

The very publication of the findings of the Kissinger Commission, released Jan. 11, has worsened the situation in the region, pulling the rug out from under regional peace initiatives already under way. The presentation of copies of the report to Ibero-American governments as representative of Administration policy, and President Reagan's support for its findings in his State of the Union address Jan. 23, compounds the problem.

On this operation, the Soviet Union has spent nary a bullet nor, one supposes, a ruble.

The Kissinger Commission Report places U.S. political prestige and muscle behind the greatest strategic threat south of the U.S. border: narco-terrorism, the guns-and-drugs trade dominating Ibero-America's black economy. It does so openly: The Commission Report states that the region's economy must be restructured to match that of Hong Kong—the coordinating center of South East Asia's booming opium and heroin traffic—if Central America is to pay its debts; it states that continuous warfare, as has occurred in Guatemala for the past 20 years, is a goal to be sought; and it states that population reduction in Central America is a goal of its authors.

Yet the baldness of the report's arguments for genocide are matched by the current political debate over the commission's recommendations within the United States: alternative policies championed by Democratic opposition voices, like the proposals to be published by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, support the economic and depopulation goals of the Kissinger Report, but argue that Kissinger's "militaristic" policies will keep those policies from being implemented successfully! Not one leading voice has warned that Kissinger's plan means more American children will die from the increased flow of drugs into the United States, sent to pay its debts to Kissinger's long-time patrons, the Rockefellers, and the other international bankers.

Central Americans are promised that "with determination and luck," their economy might return to 1980 levels of per capita economic activity by the year 1990, if the report's prescriptions are imposed successfully. The report acknowledges the implications of that "promise": in 1980, an estimated 40% of Central Americans lived in "extreme poverty," and the region's nutrition levels had fallen to the levels of the 1950s—an estimated 73% of El Salvador's children are...
Debts, the Big Stick, and gunboats return

Cited as a basis for U.S. policy is the infamous Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine, the formalization of the “American Muscle Behind British Brains” deal by the anglophilic Theodore Roosevelt at the turn of the century. Confronted with European gunboats in Venezuela’s principal harbor after that country’s president, Cipriano Castro, declared a debt moratorium, Roosevelt declared that no extra-hemispheric power could collect debts in the Western Hemisphere—henceforth the United States would do it for them. The Kissinger Commission argues:

For the most part, U.S. policy toward Central America during the early part of this century focused primarily on promoting the stability and solvency of local governments so as to keep other nations out. This was reflected in Theodore Roosevelt’s Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine, which held that the U.S. should take action to prevent situations from arising that might lead to interventions by extra-hemispheric powers.

The authors duly note that such means of “pressure” used in assuring the “solvency and stability” of the region as “customs receiverships, debt refundings, and non-recognition of governments that came to power by force” in the post-Corollary period aroused “considerable resentment” in Ibero-America. Now, debt collection is prominent concern of these heirs to Theodore Roosevelt. Ostensibly referring only to Central America, the new mechanisms proposed for restructuring Central America’s unpayable foreign debts are a message to the rest of Ibero-America, suffering under the same burden of unpayable debt.

Dictatorial mechanisms

Point three of a proposed Emergency Stabilization Program for the region states that the Central American countries “should be encouraged to seek multilateral debt renegotiation,” a departure from “existing practice,” and U.S. government pressure be brought to bear on commercial lenders to “renegotiate existing debt at the lowest possible interest rates.” A “task force of key public and private creditors as well as debtors could be established to facilitate these debt renegotiations,” the report states, charged with formulating “general guidelines for individual country negotiations.”

Proposed to oversee the package is an institution that would control financial flows to and from the region—a generalized surveillance mechanism. “A multinational body including eminent Central Americans can most effectively—and least offensively—assess progress, evaluate program objectives, and measure external resource needs. In addition, the multilateral body should exercise some degree of control over development funds to give its assessments added weight, even though donors would retain a veto.”

The model cited for the latter proposal is the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress (CIAP), a small group made up largely of economic followers of Raul Prebisch centered in the U.N.’s Economic Commission on Latin America (ECLA) which attempted to assert supranational surveillance over the Ibero-American economies. As the Kissinger Report notes, ECLA advisers to the Kissinger Commission urged a similar arrangement. CIAP had better luck than the bankers in getting payment out, “since they were mostly Latin Americans and seen to be unbiased, their advice was accepted in the constructive spirit in which it was given.”

The Hong Kong model

The chief conditionality attached to debt refinancing is the complete restructuring of the Central American economies into free-enterprise havens modeled on Hong Kong.

The commission’s suggestions were better titled “the Rockefeller bailout plan”; if implemented, this looks to be a bigger boondoggle for racketeers than former Chase Manhattan chairman David Rockefeller’s Caribbean Basin Initiative. According to the commission report, Central America’s economies must be “restructured” along the model of the British colonies, “Hong Kong, Singapore, and others.” Private-sector “initiative” must replace even the current minimal government role as “engines for growth.” The colonial plantations of United Brands, termed a “model employer and model citizen,” are the kind of “private initiative” that will benefit from Kissinger’s plans. U.S. government monies are to support these “initiatives” through funding a “privately-owned venture capital company,” to be called the Central American Development Corporation, which could prove an “innovative way to promote investment in the region even under present difficult conditions” of civil war, the commission argues.

This means drugs—production and trafficking. Some 20% of the cocaine coming into the United States is brought in on United Brands ships from Central America, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) officials estimated privately in the late 1970s. Since its founding as United Fruit, the company’s board of directors has come from the ranks of the Boston Brahmins whose ships openly traded opium with the British East India Company in the 1800s. The British Crown Colony of Hong Kong is notorious to this day as the central transshipment point for heroin and opium trafficking out of the Golden Triangle.
Depopulation warfare

The report lays out a strategy for ridding the area of people in excess of those needed to work the plantations. It is argued that the U.S. government must accept as a policy goal "a sustained reduction in population growth rates," which are considered a major strategic problem. "As we have seen, the number of Central Americans almost tripled in 30 years. The World Bank projects a further increase in the region’s population to 38 million by the end of the century," the commission worries. This for a region with one-fifth the population of Japan living in an area twice the size!

“We recommend the continuation of the population and family planning programs currently supported by the Agency for International Development” (AID), emphasizes the report, since “overpopulation presents a serious threat to the development and health of that region. Attempts must be made through education and family planning to reduce the birth rate to a more moderate level.”

AID family planning programs in El Salvador, where some $25 million has been spent on population control programs, were recently featured in the Christian Science Monitor for programs which give poor women in refugee camps a choice: If they want food, they must agree to be sterilized.

The remaining population faces a miserable future: Labor should be employed in the production of “low and medium technology goods,” the report states, and all aid channelled into “labor-intensive infrastructure and housing projects.” Suggested as a model for the future is an extension of El Salvador’s current “National Campaign Plan,” modeled on the strategic hamlet program of the Vietnam War, whereby agricultural or industrial production is carried out within “secure areas” ringed by army troops.

Energy imports into the area should be “reduced.” U.S. monies should be channeled into “health management courses” to keep “public funds from providing excessive support to hospital services.” Schooling should be restructured to offer only vocational training, since education “often has little relevance to the practical needs of students.”

Those governments who refuse to go along with the economic restructuring will not have their debts refinanced, nor receive any of the proposed “import” benefits.

Continuous war

The military proposals of the commission report are those appropriate for the economics of narco-terrorism.

America’s Ibero-American neighbors, led by the Contadora Group of Mexico, Colombia, Venezuela, and Panama, have been trying to convince friends in the Reagan administration that Central America’s war is no “left-versus-right” battle, but a deepening cycle of warring bandits destroying civilization in their wake, against whom new strategies and tactics must be used.

In a Jan. 27 television interview with the Public Broadcasting Station’s MacNeil-Lehrer Report, Mexican President Miguel de la Madrid stated bluntly that he could “not support or approve the [Kissinger] report’s findings.” He added: “The military aid to the Salvadoran government has not been effective. The military aid has been a source of arms for the guerrillas themselves,” and its increase will only “continue to be a focus of violence not only for this country, but for all Central America.”

De la Madrid’s declaration is merely a fact known to every professional involved in Central America. U.S. weapons supplies to the Salvadoran military are feeding guerrilla arsenals. The weapons falling into the hands of the guerrillas are not merely those captured from garrisons when army defenders flee under fire; weapons are being sold as well by corrupt officers commanding the ragtag bunch of 14-year-old conscripts called the Salvadoran army.

The commission’s plan does not lay out a peace-winning strategy, but rather a precise description of methods that will produce a Thirty Years’ War, the policy outcome EIR has repeatedly argued is the intention of the Kissinger group, which seeks to reduce population levels.

Guatemala’s genocidal war-fighting techniques come in for special praise by the Kissinger Commission, and the “advances” made by cultist mass murderer Efrain Rios Montt, the former Guatemalan strongman, in particular: “With 20 years of experience in counterinsurgency, the Guatemalan army has so far been able to contain the guerrilla threat... Under Rios Montt the Guatemalan army made significant progress against the guerrilla forces, combining civic action with aggressive military action into a strategy of ‘beans and bullets.’”

Those counterinsurgency techniques, based on widespread rural terror and massacres of the Indian population, forced service in killer gangs called “civil guard patrols,” and manipulation of food supplies, prompted the flight into Mexico and elsewhere of thousands of terrified Guatemalans from Rios Montt’s lunatic “holy war” against Catholics.

Nicaragua, of course, comes under special scrutiny by the Kissinger Commission. The “Marxist-Leninist regime in Managua,” says the report, constitutes a “permanent security threat” to the region. Rejecting a U.S. policy of “static containment” of the Sandinista regime, the Kissinger report insists that “force remains an ultimate recourse. The United States and the countries of the region retain this option...”

This call for overtly overthrowing the Managua government is a guarantee that the Jesuit lunatics running the Sandinista government will help explode the entire region into full-scale civil war.

Under such a scenario, not only would the Reagan administration be dragged into a Vietnam-style “monkey trap” with obvious destabilization potential for the United States. Kissinger would be positioned precisely where he wants to be: the unchallenged “back-channel” mediator of an orchestrated East-West conflict in which he and his Soviet counterparts could carve up the world into colonial spheres of influence.