

Global 2000 pushed as 'national security'

by Lonnie Wolfe

On cue, the subcommittee on International Economic Policy of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee announced last week that it would hold hearings later in February on the issues in the Global 2000 report.

Global 2000, prepared by the Carter State Department and the White House Council on Environmental Quality, recommends that the world population be lowered by more than 2 billion people. It is backed by an international conspiracy, including members of the U.S. State Department—most notably Secretary of State Alexander Haig—and members of Congress, and assorted environmental and population groups, whose members and sponsors include the leading black nobility of Europe and its American retinue. *EIR* revealed last week that the conspirators intended to use the Congress as a vehicle for brainwashing the American population to accept genocide as inevitable and necessary. Senator Mac Mathias, the subcommittee chairman from Maryland, a supporter of population control, was specifically targeted as a “man who could be used.”

In addition, the Global 2000 backers are counting on significant help from Rep. Paul McCloskey, who heads the Congressional Environmental Study Group. McCloskey, a self-professed creature of the prophylactic lobby, says that he wants to guarantee wide discussion of Global 2000—especially its population “time bomb.”

It is vital to the success of the Global 2000 effort that such discussion on an international scale start immediately, said Don Lesh, the director of the U.S. Association for the Club of Rome. Lesh is an interface between national security and State Department networks, including circles around Haig and former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger who are coordinating the Global 2000 push. A former foreign service officer with an area specialty in Russian studies, Lesh worked on the staff of the National Security Council under Henry Kissinger. Along with Helmut Sonnenfeldt and William Hyland, Lesh helped establish the NSC's Eastern European operations. From the NSC, Lesh was deployed by the same black nobility networks that run Henry Kissinger into the Club of Rome, the rabid zero-growth organization which is itself an offshoot of NATO.

This begins to trace the Global 2000 document to its

actual sponsors and authors. As the Lesh connection would indicate, the genocide policy is in fact a “national security doctrine”—a fact confirmed by the direct input and support given to the project under the Carter administration by National Security Adviser Brzezinski.

Termining population policy a “vital national security question” Lesh described the Global 2000 doctrine.

“I see the world being saturated population-wise at about 8 billion people. There are already about 4.5 billion people. According to several estimates, even if we reach 6.35 billion or a little less by the year 2000, we still are dealing with very serious population momentum. It cannot be broken by birth control and similar actions alone. That will take time. . . . I predict that there will be population-crisis-caused wars and famine based on resource and food shortages. It is going to be quite messy. Hundreds of millions of people will die over the course of the next 50 years. We will, however, one way or another, keep population at the levels projected in Global 2000.”

Lesh is one of the founders of the soon-to-be-renamed Citizens Committee for Global 2000, an umbrella organization of more than 27 environmental and population groups which helped put the “arm” on Senator Mathias to organize his hearings.

Lesh said this week that the doctrine of Global 2000 has its roots in various documents published by the Club of Rome, most directly the 1972 *Limits to Growth* report and the 1974 book, *Mankind at a Turning Point*.

Both Lesh and the State Department concur that existing programs will keep *nearly 2 billion people* in the Third World from being born by the year 2000.

“Our goal must be to do better, to keep more people from being born,” said Lesh. “This may anger the American in the Midwest with 11 kids who thinks that it is his right and everyone else's to have as many children as he wants. . . . Our first goal is to get these people to see that we must do this to the Third World or we will run out of resources and their 11 children will starve and go cold. Then, hopefully, we will get such people to back a population policy for this country.”

According to Lesh, any development of the Third World “which even suggests a new population explosion” should be ruled out. Limited resources and “environmental considerations” make industrial development of the Third World an impossibility. The production of cheap energy, especially by nuclear power, is to be ruled out.

“Global 2000 makes an important point, that development policy can be used as a weapon to keep population down,” said Lesh. Lesh and his supporters of Global 2000 bristle at suggestions that this is genocide. “We are not talking about killing anybody, we are talking about people who will not be born. . . . War arises out of scarce resources, not by design.”

Rep. McCloskey: growth means war

The following are excerpts from a recent interview with Rep. Paul McCloskey (R-Cal.) made available to EIR.

Q: Are you familiar with the Global 2000 document, particularly the implementation proposal, Global Future?

A: I have not seen the second part of it, but the document that was published last fall by the Council on Environmental Quality. Our staff of the Environmental Study Conference had our first organizational meeting last week, and decided to make it a top priority.

Q: What do you see as Global 2000 issues?

A: My focal point is on the population question and tying population growth to the development rate in a way that doesn't make the two inconsistent in looking at them on a long-range rather than a short-range basis. This is different for each country. When you are trying to dispense contraceptives and contraceptive advice, as AID tries to spread condoms all over the world, you have to question if that is a valid program. It works in some countries; in other countries the political system may have a lock where you can't sell them over the counter without the druggists' getting 1 percent. I have the great dispensers of prophylactics in my district, so I know about this. I have the guy who invented the pill. Take the country of Egypt, for example, which has 4 percent land that is arable—the Aswan Dam may be the biggest mistake they ever made. These are Global 2000 issues.

Q: You are a cosponsor of a bill with Representative Ottinger to give the United States a national population policy?

A: Yes, I was the key, way back in 1970 when we established the first population commission that Laurance Rockefeller later headed, and that went through my committee in the House, the Government Operations Committee, and this is really a follow-on to that early work in the population area.

Q: Do you agree with the concepts embodied in the original Global 2000 report?

A: I found it valuable as a factual document. I don't

fully endorse everything. . . . I personally feel that the population explosion in the world is possibly as dangerous as the nuclear proliferation. Of the two of them, Paul Ehrlich, who wrote *The Population Bomb*, has been at the center of this type of thinking. I've gone to two of the international population conferences, trying to follow up on the Bucharest Doctrine of 1974.

And the concept that a great deal of this rests on women's rights, because so many areas where the population is exceeding the development rate is partly because the women have no rights to claim anything. My daughter, for example, is running the first family planning clinic in Spain, so far as I know, where they've started performing vasectomies for the first time. And that runs counter to Spain's macho heritage. . . .

Q: Do you think that there should be an effort by the United States, perhaps by the State Department, and certainly by the world organizations you're talking about, to steer development toward the proper course?

A: Now when you say "steer a proper course," it's like the professor from Santa Barbara who said, "Sure, go ahead and give all the food and health care to India in this decade, and in the next decade, there are going to be so many people born because you artificially stimulated their anticipation of food and health, that people are going to starve." Those are very tough questions. And they differ from country to country, and there's no way the United States or any world organization can do any more than assist another country. . . .

So it's fine to talk about Global 2000 and world goals, but we haven't solved the question of dealing with the Mexican labor question. It's so delicate because we depend on the Mexicans to do our work, and they depend on us to employ illegal Mexicans, and there's a conspiracy of American business, labor, and government leaders not to enforce the laws. And if we start talking about unilateral U.S. action, quite clearly the Mexicans are entitled to be consulted.

The Pope went down to Mexico and told the priests to get out of politics, but the Catholic Church frowns on abortion, and while you don't consider abortion a tool for population limitation, if you deny the right to abortion, you are certainly enhancing population growth. No government can even negotiate on that subject, and yet it may be the crucial one. . . .

We're going to have 6 billion people in the world, that is the incredible fact that the thing is trying to come to grips with—and how each country develops or contributes to that population growth, and that population growth makes it a potential war-making nation on its neighbor because the physical resources don't measure up to the expectations of the number of people. We have the same problem in this country.