

## **EIR**SpecialReport

# The Haig-Kissinger depopulation policy

by Lonnie Wolfe

Investigations by *EIR* have uncovered a planning apparatus operating outside the control of the White House whose sole purpose is to reduce the world's population by 2 billion people through war, famine, disease, and any other means necessary.

This apparatus, which includes various levels of the government, is determining U.S. foreign policy. In every political hotspot—El Salvador, the so-called arc of crisis in the Persian Gulf, Latin America, Southeast Asia, and in Africa—the goal of U.S. foreign policy is population reduction.

The targeting agency for the operation is the National Security Council's Ad Hoc Group on Population Policy. Its policy-planning group is in the U.S. State Department's Office of Population Affairs, established in 1975 by Henry Kissinger.

This group drafted the Carter administration's Global 2000 document, which calls for global population reduction, and the same apparatus is conducting the civil war in El Salvador as a conscious depopulation project.

"There is a single theme behind all our work—we must reduce population levels," said Thomas Ferguson, the Latin American case officer for the State Department's Office of Population Affairs (OPA). "Either they [governments] do it our way, through nice clean methods or they will get the kind of mess that we have in El Salvador, or in Iran, or in Beirut. Population is a political problem. Once population is out of control it requires authoritarian government, even fascism, to reduce it.

"The professionals," said Ferguson, "aren't interested in lowering population for humanitarian reasons. That sounds nice. We look at resources and environmental constraints. We look at our strategic needs, and we say that this country must lower its population—or else we will have trouble. So steps are taken. El Salvador is an example where our failure to lower population by simple means has created the basis for a national security crisis. The government of El Salvador failed to use our programs to lower their population. Now they get a civil war because of it. . . . There will be dislocation and food shortages. They still have too many people there."



*Vietnamese civilians left on the beach at Da Nang during the war.*

Civil wars are somewhat drawn-out ways to reduce population, the OPA official added. "The quickest way to reduce population is through famine, like in Africa or through disease, like the Black Death," all of which might occur in El Salvador.

Ferguson's OPA monitors populations in the Third World and maps strategies to reduce them. Its budget for FY 1980 was \$190 million; for FY 1981, it will be \$220 million. The Global 2000 report calls for doubling that figure.

### **The sphere of Kissinger**

In 1975, OPA was brought under a reorganized State Department Bureau of Oceans, International Environmental, and Scientific Affairs—a body created by Henry Kissinger. The agency was assigned to carry out the directives of the NSC Ad Hoc Group. According to an NSC spokesman, Kissinger initiated both groups after discussion with leaders of the Club of Rome during the 1974 population conferences in Bucharest and Rome. The Club of Rome, controlled by Europe's black nobility, is the primary promotion agency for the genocidal reduction of world population levels.

The Ad Hoc Group was given "high priority" by the Carter administration, through the intervention of National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski and Secretaries of State Cyrus Vance and Edmund Muskie. According to OPA expert Ferguson, Kissinger initiated a full about-face on U.S. development policy toward the Third World. "For a long time," Ferguson stated, "people here were timid." They listened to arguments

from Third World leaders that said that the best contraceptive was economic reform and development. So we pushed development programs, and we helped create a population time bomb.

"We are letting people breed like flies without allowing for natural causes to keep population down. We raised the birth survival rates, extended life-spans by lowering death rates, and did nothing about lowering birth rates. That policy is finished. We are saying with Global 2000 and in real policy that you must lower population rates. Population reduction and control is now our primary policy objective—then you can have some development."

Accordingly, the Bureau of Oceans, International Environmental, and Scientific Affairs has consistently blocked industrialization policies in the Third World, denying developing nations access to nuclear energy technology.—the policies that would enable countries to sustain a *growing* population.

According to State Department sources, and Ferguson himself, Alexander Haig is a "firm believer" in population control.

"We will go into a country," said Ferguson, "and say, 'here is your goddamn development plan. Throw it out the window. Start looking at the size of your population and figure out what must be done to reduce it.

"If you don't like that, if you don't want to choose to do it through planning, then you'll have an El Salvador or an Iran, or worse, a Cambodia.'"

According to an NSC spokesman, the United States

now shares the view of former World Bank President Robert McNamara that the "population crisis" is a greater threat to U.S. national security interests than "nuclear annihilation."

"Every hot spot in the world corresponds to a population crisis point," said Ferguson, who would rename Brzezinski's arc of crisis doctrine the "arc of population crisis." This is corroborated by statements in the NSC Ad Hoc Group's April 1980 report.

There is "an increased potential for social unrest, economic and political instability, mass migration and possible international conflicts over control of land and resources," says the NSC report. It then cites "demographic pressures" as key to understanding "examples of recent warfare in India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, El Salvador, Honduras, and Ethiopia, and the growing

potential for instability in such places as Turkey, the Philippines, Central America, Iran, and Pakistan."

Through extraordinary efforts, the Ad Hoc Group and OPA estimate that they may be able to keep 1 billion people from being born through contraceptive programs.

But as the Ad Hoc Group's report states, the best efforts of the Shah of Iran to institute "clean programs" of birth control failed to make a significant dent in the country's birth rate. The promise of jobs, through an ambitious industrialization program, encouraged migration toward "overcrowded cities" like Teheran.

Now under Ayatollah Khomeini, the "clean programs" have been dismantled. The government may make progress because it has a program "to induce up to half of Teheran's 6 million residents to relocate, as



## Ferguson: kill more childbearers

In the past year, 13,000 people in El Salvador have been killed in the civil war that has gripped the country. To the U.S. State Department and its Office of Population Affairs, that is not enough. To accomplish what the State Department deems adequate "population control," the *civil war would "have to be greatly expanded,"* according to Thomas Ferguson, the Latin American case officer for the OPA.

El Salvador was targeted for "population control"—and war—in an April 1980 population report published by the National Security Council.

"El Salvador is an example of a serious country with serious population and political problems," the report states. "Rapid population growth—the birth rate has remained unchanged in recent years—aggravate its population density, which is already the highest on mainland Latin America. While a population

[control] program exists on paper, it has not been pursued with a strong commitment and contraceptives remain unavailable."

The population program "really did not work," OPA's Ferguson said this week. "The infrastructure was not there to support it. *There were just too many goddamn people.* If you want to control a country, you have to keep the population down. Too many people breed social unrest and communism."

"Something had to be done," the OPA official said. The birth rate, he reported, is 3.3 percent—one of the highest in the world. Its population, he complained, will double in 21 years.

"The civil war can help things, but it would have to be greatly expanded."

### Vietnam lesson

In making sure that the population falls in El Salvador, Ferguson said, the OPA has learned a lot from its experiences in Vietnam. "We studied the thing. That area was also overpopulated and a problem. We thought that the war would lower population and we were wrong."

According to Ferguson, the population in Vietnam increased during the war—despite U.S. use of defoliation and a combat strategy that encouraged civilian casualties.

To reduce population "quickly," said Ferguson, "you have to pull all the males into the fighting and kill significant numbers of fertile, child-bearing age females."

He criticized the current civil war in El Salvador: "You are killing a small number of males and not enough fertile females to do the job on the population. . . . If the war went on 30 to 40 years like this,

well as possible measures to keep rural migrants from moving to the cities.”

### Behind the back of the President

Ferguson and others involved with the OPA and NSC group maintain that the United States will continue a foreign policy based on a genocidal reduction of the world's population. “We have a network in place of cothinkers in the government,” said the OPA case officer. “We keep going, no matter who is in the White House.” But Ferguson reports that the “White House” does not really understand what they are saying and that the President “thinks that population policy means how do we speed up population increase. As long as no one says differently,” said Ferguson, “we will continue to do our jobs.”

then you might accomplish something. Unfortunately, we don't have too many instances like that to study.”

#### 'Need famine, disease'

However, said Ferguson, “The population might weaken itself, especially if the war drags on, [and] you could have disease and starvation, like what happened in Bangladesh and Biafra. Then you can create a tendency for population to fall very rapidly. This could happen in El Salvador. When that starts happening, you have total political chaos for a while, so you must have a political program to deal with it.

“I can't estimate how many people might die that way. It could be a great deal, depending on what happens.”

The preconditions for the holocaust Ferguson hopes for now exist in El Salvador.

The *New York Times* reports that the country's small and medium-size villages are *already depopulated by 50 percent*.

El Salvador survives on exports of sugar, cotton, and coffee. This year's coffee crop has been cut more than half, sugar is down by over 20 percent, and coffee by 7 percent. These facts spell mass starvation in the near term for the war-weakened peasantry.

As the war intensifies, the population is being herded into “strategic hamlets” like those run in Vietnam by U.S. military advisers.

The Jesuit-run guerrilla movement is also destroying all internal infrastructure in the countryside, burning bridges and power stations. Fully one-third of the country suffers week-long electricity blackouts.

As the war intensifies, the mass murder of the El Salvadorean people is becoming a reality.

## The NSC report

*In April 1980, the National Security Council's Ad Hoc Group on Population Policy issued an overview analysis on U.S. population policy. The document lays out the basis for all U.S. foreign policy from the “Global 2000” perspective. The State Department Office of Population Affairs helped draft the report. Excerpts follow.*

On a planet which is already subject to growing scarcities, political uncertainty, and strains on biological and environmental systems, numbers of these dimensions have portentous implications. . . .

Already during the 1970s, much of the economic gains of the Third World were canceled out by the steady rise of population. . . .

Food production is not keeping pace with the population growth in most parts of the world. . . . Moreover, rising food demand must now compete with increasingly higher priced energy imports. Norman Borlaug, pioneer of the “Green Revolution,” has cautioned that innovations in agricultural technology can only buy limited time with which to control population growth. . . .

The International Labor Organization [ILO] estimates that in the next two decades, approximately 700 million people more will enter the labor pool of developing countries—this is more than the total current labor force of the industrially advanced countries. The amount of investment required to put these people to work is astronomical. . . .

A recent Worldwatch Institute study estimated that the number of rural people who are effectively landless would approach 1 billion over the next two decades, and predicted that “conflict rooted in inequality of land ownership is apt to become more acute in country after country.” Already the estimated proportion of rural families who are landless or nearly so is over 80 percent in such countries as El Salvador, and between 70 and 80 percent in Brazil, Ecuador, Peru, Bangladesh, and the Philippines.

As rural population growth increases the fractionalization of the landholdings, as croplands are depleted due to over-intensive farming, and as job opportunities in the countryside diminish, the Third World is experiencing a virtual urban explosion. The U.N. estimates that, in only 20 years, some 40 Less Developed Countries [LDCs] cities may contain over 5 million inhabitants. . . . Provision of jobs, housing, social services to numbers of this



Cyrus Vance's State Department wrote *Global 2000*.

# The Global 2000 approach

by Lydia Schulman

The Global 2000 report, issued in spring 1980, was the culmination of a three-year study directed by the U.S. State Department and the White House Council on Environmental Quality. As the first study of global ecological trends by the U.S. government, the report does not make policy recommendations per se but claims to objectively project the impact of current (1977) trends in population growth and GNP on the global resource base and environment.

The authors of the report state that it was intended to provide the basis for long-term planning by the U.S. government and to create a permanent institutional capability—"skilled personnel, data, and analytical models"—for spinning off future studies and analyses.

They state further that the report was intended as a guide in U.S. foreign policy: "We are . . . working with other nations bilaterally, building concern for population growth, natural resources, and environment into our foreign aid programs and cooperating with our immediate neighbors on common problems ranging from the cleanup of air and water pollution to preservation of soils and development of new crops"—a statement strongly suggesting that foreign aid henceforth be tied to population control and related measures.

## The premises

As in all global models of this type, what counts are its underlying assumptions. The gross incompetence of this report and its doomsday predictions stem from the total denial of the transforming effects of science and technology: "[The projections] depict conditions that are likely to develop if there are not changes in public policies, institutions, or *rates of technological advance*, and if there are no wars or other major disruptions [emphasis added]." One of the most telling points of the report's flawed methodology is the assumption on nuclear fusion: "The projections assume no revolutionary advances—such as immediate wide-scale availability of nuclear fusion for energy production."

Given the premise of no change in the rate of technological advance, the report predicts that the projected growth of the world's population from 4 billion in 1975 to 6.35 billion in A.D. 2000 will lead to severe regional water shortages, extensive deforestation, irreparable deterioration of agricultural soils, and other horrors. The

magnitude, over such a short period of time, will present difficulties hitherto unimagined by town planners and governments. The potential susceptibility of urban unemployed youth to extremism and violence will grow.

Some recent studies suggest that the contemporary phenomena of worldwide inflation are being influenced by rising demand associated with vast increases in population. Commodities become more costly as supplies dwindle or fail to keep pace with rising demand or as they become more expensive to obtain. Population growth has also been linked to pressure on energy and raw materials supplies. A recent Worldwatch study concludes that "everywhere one turns limits are being encountered and the effects are being compounded. . . . It seems clear that the world is entering a new period of scarcity." Problems of water pollution, soil erosion, and deforestation are becoming major international issues as a consequence of over-intensive farming, grazing, encroachment of cities and uncontrolled industrialization.

All of these factors add up to an increased potential for social unrest, economic and political instability, mass migration, and possible international conflict over scarce resources. It is admittedly difficult to be analytically precise in pinpointing exact causes for the breakdown in domestic or international order. Nevertheless it is hard to avoid inferring some connection between the instabilities and frustrations caused by absolute and relative poverty, reinforced by the demographic pressures discussed above. The examples of warfare in recent memory involving India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, El Salvador, Honduras, and Ethiopia, and the growing potential for instability in such places as Turkey, the Philippines, Central America, Iran, and Pakistan, surely justify the question being raised.

conclusion a policy-maker is supposed to draw is that these consequences must be forestalled by stopping population growth short, by whatever means.

As authority on demographics, Global 2000 cites a 1969 U.S. Academy of Sciences report, *Resources and Man*, which concluded that a world population of 10 billion "is close to (if not above) the maximum that an *intensively managed* world might hope to support with some degree of comfort and individual choice."

The Global 2000 report warns that if currently projected fertility and mortality rates were to continue unchanged into the 21st century, the world's population would reach 10 billion by 2030 and nearly 30 billion—the number the NAS cites as the Earth's "maximum carrying capacity"—before the end of the century.

Among the report's other doomsday projections are:

- **On population:** "New data" on the decline in fertility rates in areas such as Indonesia and Brazil, due to unanticipated poverty and malnutrition, suggests that world fertility rates will drop by more than 20 percent over 1975-2000, from an average of 4.3 children per fertile woman to 3.3. In addition, "shifts in public policy . . . will provide significantly increased access to family planning services" in less developed countries.

"The majority of people in large LDC cities are likely to live in 'uncontrolled settlements'—slums and shantytowns where sanitation and other public services are minimal at best."

- **On food:** "Assuming no deterioration in climate or weather, food production is projected to be 90 percent higher in 2000 than in 1970. . . . In the LDCs, however, rising food output will barely keep ahead of population growth." Per capita consumption in the sub-Saharan African LDCs is slated to decline.

- **On forests:** Both forest cover and stocks of woods in the LDCs will decline by 40 percent by 2000 due to the reliance on wood for energy.

- **On water:** Due to rapidly increasing demands for water, in particular to its "highly consumptive use" in irrigation, regional water shortages and the deterioration of quality are likely to become worse by 2000. Many LDCs will also suffer the destabilization of water supplies as a result of deforestation.

- **On energy:** "No early relief from the world's energy problems." In the LDCs, the demand for wood fuel will far outstrip supply, expanding deforestation.

- **On agriculture:** Greater soil erosion, loss of nutrients, and compaction of soil, increasing salination of irrigated land, crop damage due to increasing air and water pollution is projected.

An epilogue, "Entering the Twenty-First Century," warns that without a halt in population growth trends, "The world will be more vulnerable both to natural disaster and to disruptions from human causes," including wars over increasingly scarce fresh-water supplies.

---

## INTERVIEW

---

# William Paddock on extermination

The following is excerpted from an interview with William Paddock made available to *EIR*. Paddock is outspoken proponent of global population reduction, and a self-professed supporter of the Global 2000 doctrine.

Paddock is best known for his plan to reduce the population of Mexico to less than 35 million from its present 65 million level. He is the founding member of the Environmental Fund whose goal is to "stimulate thinking about the unthinkable"—the forced reduction of the world's population. The Environmental Fund and Paddock both directly played a role in the shaping of the Global 2000 document.

Paddock had significant input into State Department policy planning during the Kissinger and Carter tenures. His plan for Mexico was endorsed by National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski. At the time of the interview, Paddock was preparing to make a presentation at the Georgetown Center for International and Strategic Studies, where Kissinger currently operates, on the effects of population on "revolution in Central America." The meeting was to be attended by key policy planners from the Haig State Department.

**Q:** What are your views on the Global 2000 document?

**A:** It's a wonderful thing, and I'm absolutely amazed at the publicity it's received. Gerald Barney [director of the Global 2000 Project] had done it single-handedly. It's excellent, and it's got far more publicity than most studies commissioned by the White House that wind up on the shelves and are never read. And it's an idea whose time has come. Now we need a U.S. 2000, and a Florida 2000, and a New York 2000, one for every state, to start planning and adapting to this situation that's coming.

**Q:** Looking at El Salvador from the standpoint of what was said in Global 2000, it seems to be a model country for disaster; landlocked, limited infrastructure, etc.

**A:** That's an advantage, you know, but go ahead.

**Q:** Well, it has limited infrastructure, and a population growth that's almost out of control, that would double in 20 years. What do you do in a situation like that, in a situation like El Salvador?

**A:** There's nothing you can do. Nothing.



Left: William Paddock. Right: Cambodia under Pot Pot.

**Q:** What is going to happen then?

**A:** Total chaos, anarchy of one kind or another. Continuing military government, maybe rightist or leftist, but a military government. You can't expect stability where you have such turmoil and stress generated by so many people.

Why do you have military governments in Latin America? They've always had one form or another of it. I was in Honduras in 1957 when they had their 75th revolution! They've had a lot of practice. Why is it? Well, it's simply because, as far as I'm concerned, the land is pee-poor. They got a poor piece of real estate. It's nobody's fault, it's just the way God passed out the resources. . . . Every single country in the world is overpopulated, but some are more so than others. Now why is that? Because El Salvador happens to have some of the finest land in all Latin America. And you can take a world population map, where you have one dot for every hundred thousand people, and except for some cities like New York, London, and Tokyo, where it'll be black, of course, wherever you have high concentrations of those dots, you have pretty good soil. And that's true in Latin America. You have it in Java, in El Salvador, in Haiti. Why? Because they've got good land. Some good land. Unfortunately, some modern technology, in the form of medical missionaries or medical doctors of one kind or another, got there before there was any other technology that reached there, and the population explosion took place before they could develop any other resources, and

get their agriculture more efficiently used. And it just exploded. It exploded faster than any other place because they had more food. They had better land. And now they've grown well past the capacity of that land to take care of them.

**Q:** So in El Salvador, are we eventually going to see a rollback of the population?

**A:** It will happen somehow.

**Q:** You mean famine, disease?

**A:** One of the four horsemen. And now the fifth one, which is the bomb.

**Q:** Can it be done without the pain and suffering?

**A:** I don't think so at all. I don't think so for a couple of reasons. First of all, speaking of the population growth rate, to level off or drop, the problem is that the people who are going to cause the stress, in the next 20 years, are already here, they're born, they're walking around. Half the population is under the age of 15. It would be well if no one had any more kids, between now and the year 2000, but the big problem's already there. The other reason is, we don't know how to motivate people to want to have fewer children. We just don't know how to do it. . . .

Malthus, in his dismal theorem, said that the only check on population growth is starvation and misery.

And no matter how favorable the environment or how advanced the technology, population will grow until it is miserable and starved. That's what he said, all right? There's an economist at the University of Colorado, a very famous economist, Kenneth Boulding, who has what he calls his "utterly miserable" theorem. And his utterly miserable theorem is that if the only check on the growth of population is starvation and misery, then any technological improvement will have the ultimate effect of increasing the sum of human misery, because it permits a larger proportion to live in precisely the same state of misery and starvation as before the change.

And this, of course, is what we're trying to do with our foreign aid program, in sending food, in improving the agriculture of the area, we're making it possible to sustain more people.

**Q:** Doesn't Global 2000 say that we should re-examine that?

**A:** Yes. I think it does say that.

**Q:** There are some who say that the best contraceptive is development.

**A:** That's bilge. In theory it probably is, but show me the country where it works. It's a grasping for excuses to get money for aid, when they come up with something like that. . . . If a country, such as El Salvador, is going to improve the lot of its people, it's going to have to bite the bullet itself. There's nothing we can do to come up with a birth control program, agricultural program, industrialization program. And by saying that we can, we put off the need for Salvador to try to do something about the problem itself. . . .

**Q:** Is the U.S. overpopulated?

**A:** Yes.

**Q:** What's your thinking on it?

**A:** I think if we had 100 million people, it would be really fabulous.

**Q:** How would we get to that level given where we are now? Is that possible without a war?

**A:** Well, there's a man putting together an organization called One Hundred Million Americans, and he's trying to show how it can be done. I don't think it can be done. We haven't bit the bullet ourselves. Look at the number of illegal aliens that we permit coming in here.

**Q:** What about El Salvador? What would be the ideal population there?

**A:** Well, when I went there in 1950, there was 1.7 million people. It's 4 million now. It was pretty bad off in 1950, but it had more charm, I'd have lived there then. Most people are barefoot. I think that as far as what the United

States can do, I think we just have to live with the situation. We have to adopt policies that can permit *us* to live with it.

**Q:** That's really what Global 2000 says. I understand you're going to deliver a paper on the effects of the revolution.

**A:** It's on the influence of population on the destabilization in Central America. . . . It's for a seminar that the Georgetown Center for Strategic and International Studies is holding on El Salvador. I don't really know the purpose of the meeting. I thought it was to help the United States form a strategy to cope with it, to what they should do with El Salvador.

**Q:** What about Cambodia? Is that an example of Malthusianism?

**A:** I don't know enough about Cambodia, but if that took place in Salvador today, because I know Salvador, I'd say yes, that is one of the scenarios you can end up with.

**Q:** You could have millions of people dying.

**A:** Well, you're going to have millions of people dying, certainly, from lack of food in the Third World, and certainly in the next 20 years, no shadow of a doubt about it. Famine is absolutely totally inevitable, there's no way to stop it. We've had good crop years the last three or four, so people feel pretty comfortable, though we're going into 1981 with the lowest reserves the world has seen since the last 10 to 15 years. You've had the population of the world growing at an *average* rate of 1 percent faster than food production has grown since 1975.

**Q:** And that's going to produce the effect you're talking about?

**A:** Well, one of these days, as long as the weather is good, we can squeak by. But the trend is always more and more on the brink. If the monsoon is two or three weeks late in India this year, it will be a very bad thing. We'll know that by July 10 or so. And our Middle West is very deficient in subsoil moisture right now, a dry year last year; the U.S. may very well be quite unable to ship the wheat, soybeans, and corn the world is counting on. And if this should happen two years in a row, there's absolutely nothing that can be done about it. But that's the trend. If it doesn't happen in two years it will happen in three or four. Absolutely positively fact. . . .

If you can blame anybody it's the medical profession.

**Q:** Because they've kept so many people alive?

**A:** Absolutely. They've given the world death control without birth control. . . . Two-thirds of the world is living on very marginal subsistence and that's 3 billion people.