

From 'War on Terror' To 'Climate Warfare'

by Ralf Schauerhammer

Under the headline "Now the Pentagon Tells Bush: Climate Change Will Destroy Us," the London *Observer's* Feb. 22 issue brought sensational news: "Climate change over the next 20 years could result in a global catastrophe costing millions of lives in wars and natural disasters. . . . A secret report, suppressed by U.S. defense chiefs and obtained by the *Observer*, warns that major European cities will be sunk beneath rising seas as Britain is plunged into a 'Siberian' climate by 2020. Nuclear conflict, mega-droughts, famine and widespread rioting will erupt across the world. . . . The document predicts that abrupt climate change could bring the planet to the edge of anarchy as countries develop a nuclear threat to defend and secure dwindling food, water, and energy supplies. The threat to global stability vastly eclipses that of terrorism."

Just how the *Observer* obtained this "suppressed" report, isn't nearly as mysterious as the editors make it out to be. The report in question is titled "An Abrupt Climate Change Scenario and Its Implications for United States National Security"; it was put together under the direction of Peter Schwartz, director of the Global Business Network. It was a working draft for a more extensive article titled "Climate Change for a National Security Threat," which appeared in *Fortune* magazine's Jan. 26 issue.

What's more interesting, is that Schwartz's paper had been commissioned (and slipped to the press) by a central planning group inside the U.S. Defense Department led by Andrew Marshall.

For over three decades, Marshall has headed up the Office for Net Assessments, and is considered to be Pentagon's *éminence grise*. Most of the key U.S. military-strategic blunders of recent decades can be traced directly to him—for example, the utopian imperial "Revolution in Military Affairs" (RMA), which can be best described as the military equivalent of the "New Economy" swindle. And it also comes as no great surprise, that Marshall has harbored a decades-long hatred against Lyndon LaRouche and his ideas.

Already in the *Fortune* article's very first sentence, parallels with the "War Against Terrorism" are clearly drawn: "Global warming may be bad news, but let's face it, most of us spend as little time worrying about it as we did about al-Qaeda before 9/11. Like the terrorists, though, the seemingly

remote climate risk may hit home sooner and harder than we ever imagined."

Also interesting is the political significance which the *Observer* attributes to the report: "So dramatic are the report's scenarios, . . . that they may prove vital in the U.S. elections." Because, amazingly, the report was commissioned "by influential Pentagon defense adviser Andrew Marshall, who . . . was the man behind a sweeping recent review aimed at transforming the American military under Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld." And coming thus out of that corner, it means big trouble for Bush, reports the *Observer*: "The findings will prove humiliating to the Bush Administration, which has repeatedly denied that climate change exists. . . . Democratic frontrunner John Kerry is known to accept climate change as a real problem. . . . The fact that Marshall is behind its scathing findings will aid Kerry's cause."

Nor can the Bush Administration acquiesce in the false hope that the issue might not emerge as a major one over the next few months, because on May 28, a new film, "The Day After Tomorrow," is set to hit the box offices. It enacts a sudden and catastrophic entry into a new Ice Age, with scenes just as gripping as were those of another film made 21 years ago, "The Day After," about the aftermath of a nuclear strike against the United States.

The 'Scientific' Background

Just how hastily this new scare campaign has been cooked up, is demonstrated by its flimsy scientific underpinnings. *Fortune's* account refers to Schwartz's "secret report" in these terms: In connection with the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, there was "a session at which Robert Gagosian, director of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution in Massachusetts, urged policymakers to consider the implications of possible abrupt climate change within two decades." The reference is fitting, because it was those theses presented by Gagosian to the World Economic Forum in January 2003, which Schwartz has uncritically adopted as his own.

According to Gagosian's theory, global warming will lead to a steady increase in the amount of melt-off water in the world's oceans, which, in turn, will cause the warm Gulf Stream to suddenly change course, such that it will no longer reach into the Northern Atlantic. This, in turn, will trigger a sudden global climate change, which will manifest itself differently in various parts of the globe—but always with negative effects: In cold regions, it will get even colder, and in warm regions, drought and desertification will increase, whereas in regions with storms and monsoon rains, the intensity of those weather events will increase catastrophically.

All this, of course, can be modelled and precalculated by computers—but that still doesn't make science fiction into real science, by a long shot.

In fact, there's nothing new about this theory. The basic



Pentagon utopian planner Andrew Marshall, behind the promotion of the new scare of “climate-change warfare.” Now that the debacle of the neo-conservatives’ strategy of preventive nuclear war in Iraq is clear, Anglo-American utopian policy circles are pushing a Malthusian military policy, whereby the conjured threat of world climate change would be used to rope in Europeans and international organizations to prepare for war over scarce resources.



outline was set forth back in 1997,¹ and already in 2001, Gagosian made an identical presentation on “The Economic and Social Consequences of Global Environmental Changes.” But back then, Peter Schwartz was apparently concentrating on other things, and this crucial issue somehow escaped his notice. Indeed, back then—shortly after Sept. 11, 2001—Peter Schwartz wrote the following on the Global Business Network’s website: “If it is true, as many are arguing, that World War III has begun, then it is critical to understand what the war is about. . . . Osama bin Laden is only the expression of a much bigger problem. . . . Throughout the Islamic world, from Pakistan to the Middle East and North Africa, there are very few successful nation-states. Most of them have failed. . . . They need an enemy to justify their failure. . . . There at least ten key countries, in three groups, that need to be dealt with in any broad campaign against terrorism.” The countries named include Sudan, Afghanistan, Saudi Arabia, Iran, and Syria. According to Schwartz, “Our targets must be both the terror network and the governments that support it. We much punish the evildoers by eradicating them.”

1. See R.B. Alley, T. Sowers, P.A. Mayewski, M. Stuiver, K.C. Taylor, and P.U. Clark, “Holocene Climate Instability: A Prominent, Widespread Event 8,200 Years Ago,” in *Geology*, Vol. 26, No. 6, 1997.

But now that the neo-conservatives’ preventive warfare doctrine has demonstrably failed to have the desired effect, Schwartz has suddenly discovered that the world’s climate poses a “threat to global stability” which “vastly eclipses that of terrorism”!

The Political Motive: ‘Perpetual War’

But Schwartz goes further, putting his own overlay on top of Gagosian’s abrupt climate-change theory and “Weather Report for 2010-2020.” Gagosian’s forecast can’t be perfectly accurate, of course, but nevertheless “there appears to be general agreement in the scientific community that an extreme case like the one depicted below is not implausible,” Schwartz writes. In view of the fact that even local short-term weather forecasts are fraught with inaccuracies when they concern situations involving rapid transitions between high and low pressure, there certainly does not exist any such “general agreement in the scientific community” as Schwartz claims.

But this fib is small potatoes, compared to some of his other assertions. For example, he predicts that a catastrophic climatic reversal will occur as early as 2007, and on that basis, he spins out an end-of-the-world scenario fitting for a new movie script.

And in fact, it's easy to see from the overall style of his "secret report," that Schwartz has been functioning for some time now as an adviser to Hollywood producers, e.g., for Steven Spielberg's film "Minority Report." Schwartz gasps, "As glacial ice melts, sea levels rise, . . . ocean waves increase in intensity, damaging coastal cities. Additionally, millions of people are put at risk of flooding around the globe. . . . Fisheries are disrupted as water temperature changes cause fish to migrate to new locations. . . . Drought persists for the entire decade in critical agricultural regions and in the areas around major population centers in Europe and North America. . . . Winter storms and winds intensify," etc., etc.

By floating this climate catastrophe scenario, Schwartz has laid the groundwork for his main political clincher: "As abrupt climate change lowers the world's carrying capacity, aggressive wars are likely to be fought over food, water, and energy."

And wouldn't you know it? Just in time, a new book has come out by Harvard professor Steven LeBlanc, which "describes the relationship between carrying capacity and warfare." According to LeBlanc, future warfare is going to a bit different: "Advanced states have steadily lowered the body count. . . . Instead of slaughtering all their enemies in the traditional way, for example, states merely kill enough to get a victory and then put the survivors to work in their newly expanded economy. . . . All of that progressive behavior could collapse if carrying capacities everywhere were suddenly lowered drastically by abrupt climate change. Humanity would revert to its norm of constant battles for diminishing resources. . . . Once again warfare would define human life."

Given the existence of weapons of mass destruction, this scenario would imply the extermination of most human beings on this planet. According to Schwartz, "In this world of warring states, nuclear arms proliferation is inevitable. . . . China, India, Pakistan, Japan, South Korea, Great Britain, France, and Germany will all have nuclear weapons capability, as will Israel, Iran, Egypt, and North Korea."

Now, some dolts might have a crazy idea that the new trend toward proliferation is the result of Cheney and Rumsfeld's strategy of preventive nuclear warfare using so-called "mini-nukes." But strategic thinker Peter Schwartz sets us straight on that one: On the contrary, it's all the weather's fault! And Andrew Marshall has nothing but applause for such brilliant thinking.

Eurasian Land-Bridge: Alternative to the Malthus Reflex

Incredibly, the entire "secret report" contains not a single solitary word on the significance of the economy for national security—despite the fact that only a few years ago, Peter Schwartz himself made some rather pithy comments on the course of the world economy. In his

1999 book *The Long Boom*, which he co-authored with Peter Leyden, he forecast a coming period of sustained growth, during which the world economy would double in size every 12 years, and would bring increasing prosperity to billions of people. Up through 2020, the new information technologies would have spread the fundamental economic and political values of the U.S.A. into all parts of the planet, and problems such as poverty, cancer, and global warming would have been either eliminated or substantially reduced, according to this seer.

Such propaganda for globalization and "free-trade optimism" is merely one side of the neo-liberal coin; on its flip side, one can clearly distinguish the ugly face of Malthusian wars of extermination under conditions of reduced carrying capacity.² On July 13, 2000, Schwartz told an *EIR* reporter: "In 1986 [i.e., before he had published his optimistic boom book], I did a study on this for AT&T, Royal Dutch Shell, and Volvo. We concluded that people who have AIDS in Africa should not be kept alive; they spread the disease. It is better they should die quickly." Here he's showing the kind of social Darwinism, usually allied with outright racism, that is typical of such neo-liberals. It would be interesting to know whether Schwartz now recommends the same prescription for AIDS victims in the United States and Europe.

In Europe, where the political elite has been more receptive to Malthusian ideas, there could arise the false illusion that Europeans could have an important role as junior partner, by "overcoming the climate-related security threats" concomitant with decreasing "carrying capacity." But beware! Malthus concocted his theory of limited carrying capacity in order to establish a political basis for abolishing centuries-old social laws; to rescue the economically bankrupt British Empire; and also, at the same time, to deprecate the successes of the young American republic. So, now, apparently, dismantling social services and protections has once again become the "in" thing.

The actual alternative to all this, both economically and from the standpoint of national security policy, is to establish a republican economy according to the principles of physical economy, as set forth by Lyndon LaRouche. Europe should not allow itself to be seduced into either a false "War Against Terrorism," or a Malthusian war of extermination based on a fraudulent theory about of the Earth's "carrying capacity." Instead, Europe should not waver in adopting the concept of cooperation in constructing the Eurasian Land-Bridge, and in doing all that is required to rescue Africa out of its current pit of despair.

2. Ralf Schauerhammer, "Warum es wirklich keine Grenzen des Wachstums gibt" ("Why There Really Aren't Any Limits to Growth"), in *Neue Solidarität*, No. 15, April 10, 2002. This appeared in English in *21st Century Science & Technology*, Spring 2002.