

Gen. Maxwell Taylor, the Soviets, and Global 2000

by Lonnie Wolfe

"There is a faction in the Soviet Union that is perfectly willing to let most of the Third World go under," Maxwell Taylor, former commander of U.S. forces in Vietnam, told an interviewer late last month.

Taylor is a member of the Population Crisis Committee/Draper Fund, a core group initiating the State Department's Global 2000 report. That report advocates reducing world population by 2 billion people by the year 2000. In the interview excerpted below, the retired general identifies himself as among the U.S. strategists who have cultivated such a faction in the U.S.S.R. His colleagues in that effort include former ambassador W. Averell Harriman, former Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, and former Undersecretary of State George Ball, all of whom share the Global 2000 outlook.

Their Soviet counterparts are centered around the KGB intelligence apparatus and the Soviet think tanks IMEMO and the U.S.A.-Canada Institute, the latter run by Georgii Arbatov. IMEMO is a longstanding channel of Soviet liaison with the zero-growth Club of Rome, which overlaps with the PCC/Draper Fund; both institutions reject advanced "capitalist" technology for the Third World for World Bank subsistence economies. They are politically backed by Boris Ponomarev of the Central Committee and other sponsors of "radical revolution" for the sake of destabilizing the West.

Taylor and his cothinkers believe they have a deal with the KGB-IMEMO group that will set limits on the level of conflicts between the superpowers in the developing sector, in a modern form of surrogate warfare whose major purpose will be to produce conditions of continuous war and famine to destroy populations. In

this way Taylor hopes to meet the goals prescribed by Global 2000.

As General Taylor fails to note, this Soviet faction is in overall opposition to the elements of the current Kremlin leadership centered around President Leonid Brezhnev, which continues to seek cooperation with Western Europe for the development of the Third World.

It should also be noted that, while Taylor claims that the U.S. has no population-planning center, he and his friends built into the U.S. State Department and related foreign policy agencies just such a capability during the Vietnam war, that continues to function through the Ball-created State Department Coordinator for Population Affairs and the Kissinger-established National Security Council Ad Hoc Group on population policy.

Taylor: 'The U.S.S.R. will let Third World die'

The following excerpts are from an interview with General Maxwell Taylor, provided to EIR. General Taylor, former special military representative of President Kennedy and commander of U.S. forces in Vietnam, is the author of a 1980 policy paper draft for the Population Crisis Committee, redrafted in January 1981 under the title "The Population Crisis and U.S. National Security Interests." The paper lists the Third World nations vital to U.S. interests as: Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Korea, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Philippines, Somalia, Thailand, Turkey, Vene-

zuela, and Zimbabwe. Taylor contends that their stability is jeopardized by excessive population growth rates.

Q: Have you and the other Draper Fund people considered what will happen to the countries that are not on your list as important to U.S. needs? Won't the Soviets have a free hand to come in and aid them and extend their influence?

A: We are of one mind that there is a Soviet faction who for the last 30 years has been perfectly willing to let parts of the Third World go under. You have to understand the mind of the Soviet "Mother Russia" faction. They care about their country. They care about the countries on their immediate borders. They don't give a damn, really, about the rest of the world. They have no desire to develop anything outside this limited area. Their view is that the Soviet Union and its immediate colonies are totally self-sufficient energywise and in minerals. They have no use for the minerals supply of the Third World. Their goal is to deny this to the West. They will use the population crisis to foment rebellion and coups d'état in these countries. They may take over a country here and there for a time, but their only real policy is continuous destabilization to deny resources to the West.

Q: Very strong statements came out of the 26th [Soviet] Party Congress about science and industrial growth. You don't believe this will affect their foreign policy, I take it.

A: All their congresses talk about building up Mother Russia. They were talking about making the Soviet Union strong and keeping it that way. What is their development policy toward the Third World? They don't have one.

Q: Is your paper intended for circulation within the new administration?

A: It was written as a strategic document. You should note that my report is already quite selective about what can be saved. I have already written off more than a billion people. These people are in places in Africa, Asia, Latin America. We can't save them. The population crisis and the food-supply question dictate that we should not even try. It is a waste of time. The Soviets are not about to save them, either.

There will be horrible consequences for our failure to heed the warnings of General Draper and others. These people will suffer from continuous cycles of natural disaster, famine, hunger, floods, drought. Upwards of 500 million people will try to escape, become refugees, flee across borders. Most of them will never make it. Some old fools and young ones may talk of trying to mount a noble effort to help these people, and I am sure we will try to do the humanitarian thing. But they can't be saved, and

Q: You mean that we should focus relief efforts on the countries you list.

A: We cannot even save all the strategic countries. We don't have the resources. The Soviets will make things very costly by stirring up trouble. What we must do is make some difficult choices. If we can get oil from places like Mexico, then we can write off Nigeria.

The demographics dictate that there will be breakdown crises in these countries. The Soviets may pick up a few, but they won't be able to keep them alive, either. They can't afford too many Cubas; it drains their resources. . . . They really don't look at the demographics any differently than we do. It is just that they don't have to worry about what their population thinks about difficult political decisions, ones that write off millions of people. There is not enough food or capital to save everybody. To save a few, it will take hundreds of billions of dollars. Each will have to reduce population growth rates, and population where necessary.

Q: Do you have a sense of whether Bill Draper would take the General's views into account in running the Eximbank?

A: It's an excellent thing that the boy is going to take it over. I've known him for years; he's a good boy, just like his father. But he won't be able to do much at the bank. What does he have to work with—a couple of billion dollars? He can do some seed work, not much else. It's going to take all the money in Europe and all the petrodollars to make even a credible effort at saving a few countries; the boy knows that.

Q: How is population policy shaping up elsewhere in Washington?

A: There is no real population crisis response mechanism in the U.S. government. Ideally, the National Security Council would become a National Policy Council and expand its function to implement population policy. For now, decisions will be made through the NATO command, which thinks demographically. Their decisions must be imposed with the full weight of the West. The Soviets are aware of this; they will conduct limited surrogate warfare for certain areas. They will not fight a world war over areas of the world they don't need. These are the rules of the modern game.

Q: Were you personally close to General Draper?

A: Yes, I admired him very much. He was a wonderful person. I heard my first lecture on the population explosion by him at the Army War College in 1940. MacArthur never really understood this. He was really wrong.

At this point in human history, a population-induced catastrophe is unavoidable. We must plan for it. We started to deal with the population problem far too late to spend more wasted time. . . .



Taylor on population

Below are excerpts from the revised January 1981 draft of "World Population Growth and U.S. Security Interests," written by Gen. Maxwell Taylor for the Population Crisis Committee/Draper Fund. Emphasis is in the original.

The relationship between U.S. security interests and rapid population growth abroad can be stated very simply: nearly all those Third World countries in which the United States has one or another vital security interest have very serious population problems. These population problems, because they threaten the long-range economic and political viability of such countries, undermine their dependability as U.S. allies and trading partners. Included prominently are countries in Latin America, East Asia, South Asia, and the Middle East. . . . Any number of them could become the next Iran.

One need, in fact, look no further than the Middle East region to understand these dangerous trends. This area contains the so-called "arc of crisis" extending from Pakistan to Egypt and Turkey. . . . Other countries affected by severe population pressures include additional key suppliers (or potential suppliers) of U.S. petroleum imports, such as Indonesia, Mexico, Venezuela, and Nigeria—already heavily populated countries with high rates of growth. They also include Bolivia, Brazil, Morocco, the Philippines, Zimbabwe, and Thailand, which supply essential U.S. imports of tin, antimony, tungsten, manganese, vanadium and columbium ore, chromite and tantalum. The U.S. Department of the Interior estimates that by the year 2000, the U.S. will be dependent on imports for 12 out of 13 of the most critical minerals required by U.S. industry. Some of America's principal allies in the Third World, including those where U.S. bases or staging areas are now located or under consideration, also fall into the high-population-pressure category. . . .

[N]o amount of aid will keep these countries from eventually going under if population growth continues unchecked. . . . If, as a result of horrendous population pressures, U.S. allies are unable to satisfy the most basic

needs of their countrymen over the long run, they will be able to contribute little to U.S. efforts to block communist expansion and maintain a peaceful balance in strategic regions of the world like the Middle East. . . .

Regional political conflicts are likely to intensify as population pressures increase the scramble for land, water, and other essentials and as unemployment spills over national borders in the form of larger labor migrations. . . . As resentment and frustration grow, new opportunities are created for extremist forces to foment civil unrest and ultimately to bring down governments friendly to the U.S. . . .

Competent observers, such as former Undersecretary of State George Ball, who conducted a study of Iran for President Carter, cite the overcrowded slums of Teheran as an important factor in the 1978-79 upheaval in Iran. By the year 2000 there will be 46 cities of over 5 million people in developing countries, and 18 of over 10 million. . . .

Even the People's Republic of China, though successful in reducing population growth to nearly 1 percent per year, has been frustrated in its efforts to enforce regulations of migration to its cities. . . .

There are several ways in which the United States can exert pressure on governments to make such a commitment to population planning:

First, we can analyze all countries receiving U.S. development assistance according to the strength of their population efforts and use these findings as one factor in the allocation of economic assistance. At the same time, we can offer to increase [U.S.] population planning assistance. . . .

Second, we could earmark some of security-supporting assistance to Egypt, Jordan, Turkey, and others for their population programs. Security-supporting funds represent a somewhat larger sum than general bilateral development funds, yet while 16 percent of the latter are allocated for population planning, almost none of the security-supporting funds are so allocated.

Third, we can and should require that State, Commerce, and Defense Department officials and others who do business with the top levels of government in these countries (a) have a thorough understanding of population problems and their importance to long-range U.S. and host countries' security concerns, and (b) document their efforts to drive this point home on every appropriate occasion. To facilitate such a process, the State Department should be instructed to place a population officer in all U.S. embassies or AID missions of any size in the developing world.

Fourth, we should ensure that population funds which are now in the President's budget are increased and insulated from the deep budget cuts which will be necessary to bring government spending in line with expected government revenues. . . .