

# Stockman's Global 2000 approach

*Contributing Editor Christopher White identifies the real planners of the Stockman budget and its consequences for world population potential.*

Crucial features of the economic package drafted for the Reagan administration by David Stockman, head of the Office of Management of the Budget, have been lifted directly from the genocide blueprints *Global 2000 Report* and *Global Future, Time for Action*.

These reports, commissioned during the administration of the psychotic Jimmy Carter, committed the United States as a nation to the policy goal of reducing the world's population by over 2 billion people between now and the year 2000.

The adoption of these reports is touted by supporters in the National Resources Defense Council and the World Wildlife Fund as a historical first. "For the first time a major nation has adopted global goals of population control as its policy," an environmentalist spokesman said in a recent interview.

If the adopted features of the Carter program, including the specific evils foisted on the Reagan administration by Stockman, are not reversed promptly, the result intended by the drafters of the plan will be genocide on a scale incomparably greater than anything Adolf Hitler contemplated. In the words of Harlan Cleveland, the NATO-Aspen Institute spokesman who is systematically promoting Global 2000, "With no development policy and a Kissinger-Brzezinski line, we'll get the politics of turbulence and chaos in the Third World. . . . Break-downs like in El Salvador . . . could easily degenerate into a hundred Cambodias, where, if they haul off and kill one-third of the population, this would be delightful for the demographers."

Those who are now defending the so-called economic package on the grounds that "it should be given a chance to work" should be informed that their ignorance or stupidity is making them accomplices of those whose evil intent is to reduce the world's population by the indicated order of magnitude.

The Stockman budget follows the Global 2000 blueprint in the following areas.

- Proposed cutbacks in science and science education programs.
- Cutbacks in government-backed high technology and infrastructural programs, such as the proposed cuts

in NASA space program funding and in internal water resources development programs.

- Cutbacks in labor and social service programs.

The pedigree of Stockman's budget hit list is recognized by supporters of the Global 2000 policy such as John Oakes, former senior editor of the *New York Times*. In a Feb. 17 op-ed, Oakes proposed the elimination of certain water projects, including Tennessee-Tombigbee, the Red River Waterway, and expansion of Lock and Dam 26 on the Mississippi.

In a followup interview, Oakes told an investigative reporter, "I got most of my information for that editorial from the *Global 2000* report and its current update the *Global Future*."

## Who's behind Global 2000

As *EIR* has identified, the Global 2000 genocide perspective was elaborated during the Carter administration by the largest interagency task force ever assembled within the U.S. government, collaborating with selected outside advisers.

The teams were at the time under the direction of Oakes's fellow *New York Times* associate Secretary of State Cyrus Vance and his successor Edmund Muskie.

The task force built upon foundations that had been laid within the State Department and the National Security Council by Henry Kissinger, who was responsible for the establishment of population control offices in both the indicated sections of the executive branch.

Now Cyrus Vance has joined with Elliot Richardson, holder of a variety of government positions under Presidents Nixon and Ford, Aspen Institute head Robert O. Anderson of Atlantic Richfield, and others to form a "Committee for the Year 2000" to ensure that the genocidal goals adopted by the former Carter administration are continued under President Reagan. Senate hearings sponsored by Sen. Charles McC. Mathias of Maryland have already been held to elaborate their genocidal perspective.

This combination, for example, created the ongoing bloodbath in El Salvador in order to further their objectives. As they did so, they gloatingly asserted that

new Secretary of State Alexander Haig was their man. Subsequently Latin American desk officer Thomas Ferguson in the State Department's Office of Population Affairs has reported that problems in that country are caused by overpopulation, and that bloodshed will continue until that population is reduced. Muskie, Vance, and their allies plunged black Africa into the holocaust of war, famine, and drought which now endangers over 100 million people. The Carter administration repeatedly refused to adopt policies that could reverse that crisis.

### **The predecessors**

The Global 2000 project is the latest outgrowth of a series of efforts set into motion in the late 1960s with the 1967 formation of the neo-Malthusian Club of Rome of Aurelio Peccei as a branch of NATO intelligence and with the concomitant secret recommendations of Robert Rapaport, the Ann Arbor, Michigan-based agent of London's Tavistock Institute, to cut back the NASA space effort because the scientific and technological ramifications of the program were proliferating too rapidly for Tavistock's liking. Stockman's present budget follows the same tradition.

In 1969, Richard Nixon established a Presidential Commission on Population. That commission included in its membership such individuals as George D. Woods, former World Bank president and a spokesman for the genocidal policies of the environmental lobby. The Presidential Commission reported its findings in 1972, including the recommendation that the growth of U.S. population no longer be regarded as beneficial.

The 1972 report correlated the global availability of cheap, abundant sources of energy and water with potentials for population growth. It was asserted that control of energy and water were key to accomplishing goals of population reduction.

The cited presidential report was followed later in the 1970s by the series of publications sponsored by the Club of Rome, including the Meadows and Forrester *Limits to Growth* tract and others. Using different languages to accommodate to the different susceptibilities of populations to accept policies that mean their own suicide, the Club of Rome reports elaborated the Presidential Commission's argument.

Global 2000, based as it is on conceptions of finite resources, the earth's finite capacity to support life and so forth, continues the tradition.

In 1970 it was projected that there would be over 8 billion inhabitants of the globe by the year 2000. By the mid-1970s that figure had been reduced to approximately 7 billion. By the time Global 2000 was issued, the estimate had been reduced further to approximately 6.35 billion. Despite much lying by the proponents of finite-resource economics, the advocates of Global

2000-type perspectives know perfectly well why such a projected drop has occurred, and why humanity's capacity to support a potentially enlarged population base has been curtailed in the way it has.

These are the circles exemplified by George Ball, coconspirator to install the Khomeini regime, and by the Club of Rome's George McGhee, who, in McGhee's words, exult that "high [oil] prices have kept world population down."

These are also the circles that have fought relentlessly for more than a decade to slow up and stop the development of nuclear energy, and to curtail the investment of funding for nuclear fusion development. Full-cycle fission technology, pushed ahead rapidly more than a decade ago, would have made available the cheap and abundant sources of energy the drafters of the Nixon report on population feared. At the same time, adequate and sustained funding of fusion programs would have contributed to advancing the frontiers of basic science to the point where humanity could be capable of overcoming so-called finite resource problems for an era to come.

### **Stockman and Volcker**

Not surprisingly Stockman's budget axe has fallen particularly hard on both basic science and the fusion program, as part of a supposed compromise with the genocidal austerity policies of Paul Adolph Volcker, who, as an advocate of the Council on Foreign Relations 1980s Project, is himself an adherent of the Global 2000 bestiality.

Volcker, like Cyrus Vance, Elliot Richardson, and Robert O. Anderson, knows that human survival is dependent on constantly enhancing, through scientific breakthroughs, the availability of cheap and abundant energy. He therefore proposes that credit policy be shaped to abort the realization of the moral human obligation to posterity to ensure the continued basis for human existence. Volcker and Vance know what they are doing, despite the fact that the scale of the genocide envisioned staggers the imagination of the ordinary citizen who has grown inured to the constant demand for ever more austerity.

Stockman's proposed budget is an instrument of the broader policy on behalf of which Volcker, Vance, and company are deployed. His supporters and dupes are to be encouraged to change their minds in light of the genocidal consequences of their continued toleration of such efforts and outlooks. Much as they may desire to achieve growth policies, they need to be reminded that a label marked jelly-beans does not always guarantee the contents of the jar.

Stockman's sponsors are not so cautious in the presentation of their policy, as the following interviews and comments attest.

## Harlan Cleveland: '100 Cambodias'

*The following interview with Harlan Cleveland, provided to EIR, took place on March 2. Mr. Cleveland is the director of the Hubert Humphrey Foundation in Minneapolis and former director of the program in international affairs of the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, Princeton.*

**Q:** What is the Reagan administration's foreign economic policy?

**A:** Reagan doesn't have a foreign economic policy, and the administration is not likely to be at all concerned about economics in the Third World. Haig is taking charge, but so far all he has is a military policy. It sounds just like the old Kissinger-Brzezinski policy, no economic content, but purely looking at the world through the prism of U.S.-Soviet relations. This means we'll be experiencing a lot of trouble, more than if we treated development policy as if it were economics. As I wrote in my piece, "The Triple Collision of Modernization," there are going to be plenty of Irans and El Salvadors; the lack of development policy could result in El Salvadors in over a hundred countries I can think of. In a country like El Salvador, we need a development policy which treats the problem like a land-reform problem. In Iran, we need a policy to deal with and cooperate with Islamic law and domestic culture. Then there is the rate at which modernization, industrialization, is colliding with the fairness revolution, where people just don't think "trickle down" is fair. We need a policy to ameliorate that.

But Reagan has no policy. In fact, I hear he's going to abolish the International Development Cooperation Administration, which Tom Ehrlich set up at the White House. And with no development policy, and a Kissinger-Brzezinski line, we'll get the politics of turbulence and chaos in the Third World, which will then become the drive-wheel of world politics. This failure to ameliorate the development process is a national security issue. Development, industrialization, produces turbulence, security problems, terrorism; it's the most dangerous part of our national security problem today. It's just not on the Reagan agenda. So the major thing I expect is not mushroom clouds, but one hundred El Salvadors. We will be experiencing a pervasive incapacity to govern by national governments all over the world. Governments

will be torn apart by the split resulting from this process in society.

**Q:** What does this mean for Third World economic growth?

**A:** It means a wider and wider chasm between the El Salvadors of the Fourth World, which will not even have the term "growth" applicable to them, and the Koreas of the newly industrializing world. Growth in the El Salvadors will not be the word. It will be un-growth. It means that population will cease to be a serious problem in these areas.

**Q:** What about the warnings of Global 2000 on the need to reduce population?

**A:** As a matter of fact, I found the predictions of world population size and resource scarcity in Global 2000 strikingly optimistic. Previous reports had been much gloomier, had estimated much bigger populations and much more resource scarcity, especially of oil and water, well before 2000. Global 2000's timeframe for running out of things is not so quick. They don't even see any havoc in water scarcity until the turn of the century, which I'd rate as very optimistic. My impression has been that the *one* thing we need to worry about is water. The draining of U.S. groundwater is alarming, the rate we are using it here out West. And it will only get worse, because we have to cut all these water projects, which are harmful to the environment. It can't be helped, it's a double bind.

**Q:** But what do you mean "more optimistic?"

**A:** I mean, Global 2000 is much more optimistic about our being able to get population down by 2000. They apparently are taking what I've said about turbulence in the Third World into their calculations.

**Q:** You mean that breakdowns in El Salvador and so forth will reduce population growth?

**A:** Within a given country. We've got breakdowns in El Salvador, had breakdowns in Lebanon, and complete breakdown in Cambodia. Mere breakdowns like in El Salvador in these hundred countries won't be enough to make a difference in global population growth, the countries are too small. But these could easily degenerate into a hundred Cambodias, where, if they haul off and kill one-third of the population—which would be delightful for the demographers—this is a much more plausible way to affect world population growth. It is also not inconceivable that we would have El Salvador in the bigger countries like India, Bangladesh, Pakistan—particularly the fairness revolution will hit there, with the trickle-down theory failing completely. These are the countries which would really make a difference to world population.

**Q:** Do you see such things in the Mideast, any more  
Iran?

**A:** Yes, I see the potential for several blowups and disintegrations of capitalist governments on the El Salvador model. Many of these countries do not have governments with credibility to the population under the fairness revolution, like Saudi Arabia. The fairness revolution will not allow Saudi Arabia to go on producing oil at these rates, which are regarded as a handout to the Americans.

**Q:** Do you see a further rise in oil prices?

**A:** Yes, and probably a real price rise.

**Q:** John Swearingen of Standard Indiana said he saw \$80 a barrel by 1985.

**A:** That's in the right direction, but too conservative. We need to have oil prices rise not only with inflation, but we need a rising real oil price to make alternative fuels economic. We should deregulate all oil and natural gas, and let prices rise through the market price mechanism. Then we can do away with government subsidies to synfuels and so on. This is what Reagan is doing, and on this I agree fully with him. We are going to get real environmental conservation through his program, because at higher prices people will consume less. That's what's important—to get a reduction in per capita energy consumption.

**Q:** What will be the effect of this on Europe?

**A:** Extremely onerous. Their only answer will be to move further and faster into the innovative industries, information industries which are less energy-intensive, and less resource-using. They will have to move a lot faster. I'm not doing much work on this for Europe, although my brother, Harold van B. Cleveland, is chairing some OECD committee on the subject. But basically Europe will have to make a total industrial policy adjustment as we do here. We can no longer have an industrial policy which just rescues the weak sisters and stifles the strong industries. Look at our priorities—backwards, we rescue Chrysler and sue IBM. Insane. A nonsense policy. We're going to be having a conference here at the end of April on "Industrial Vitalization." Notice, I omitted the "Re-" in "Vitalization." That's for Chrysler and for the steel industry. We have to make clear we don't have scarce resources to throw away on revitalizing these. Chrysler should be merged away, like they do in Japan, and Reagan is heading in the right direction on this. We have to get the government out of providing these services altogether, and bet most of our marbles on new technologies. I mean technologies which are non-energy-intensive and non-resource-intensive. This way we can have a society which is much less energy-intensive per capita, here in the U.S. We should structure all our tax

breaks, for example, to much, much faster depreciation, only for these new-technology industries.

**Q:** Who is coming to your conference.?

**A:** Malcolm Baldrige, Henry Reuss, people like that. That's who you can talk to about Europe; the best people on Europe are at the JEC.

**Q:** Will lowering energy per capita help reduce our population growth?

**A:** Yes, among Americans, but then we'll have to stop the waves of immigration we're going to get. We're bound to have to clamp down hard. As the U.S. population falls, immigrants will pour in. We'll have to come to an agreement.

**Q:** Could Mexico be the next Iran?

**A:** Certainly, they're handling it quite badly—the Iran problem. They've forgotten all about the revolution; they have a lot of prosperity for a few. Mexico could be badly unstable.

---

## George McGhee

---

*From a March 2 interview with George McGhee, director and former chairman of Mobil Oil, provided to EIR. Mr. McGhee was ambassador to Turkey in 1951-53, adviser to NATO and the National Security Council in 1959-61, and ambassador to West Germany in 1963-68. He is currently a director of the Aspen Institute and a member of the Population Crisis Commission.*

**Q:** What has been the Reagan administration's reaction to Schmidt?

**A:** Schmidt's statements are not appreciated here in Washington. His judgment is not good. No one is going to listen to him, and U.S. interest rates won't be affected in the least.

**Q:** Why has there been no Reagan response to Schmidt?

**A:** There is no necessity felt by Reagan's people to respond to him. They don't care about international pressures. They intend to take care of domestic inflation, no matter what the international ramifications. They have no international policy as far as I can see.

**Q:** What does this mean for the world economy?

**A:** U.S. rates will keep rising, or stay high, as long as there is inflation. There will be inflation as long as there is overconsumption and transfer payments in the West.

**Q:** What about oil prices, do they contribute to the problem?

**A:** Oil prices will continue to rise and will make the problem worse and worse. OPEC will be raising the price

of oil equal at least to each yearly rise in world inflation. You could say that oil prices are indexed to inflation.

**Q:** Will OPEC approve the OPEC Long-Term Strategy document indexation?

**A:** Oil is already de facto indexed. This is the real cause of Germany's problem, it hurts them worst in Europe, and it hurts the Third World. It will only make the German economy worse and worse, and there is nothing that can be done. The administration has no policy regarding this, other than that we must cut our own oil consumption, as the Germans have done.

**Q:** Does this mean permanent recession for Germany?

**A:** It means Europe will be in recession for a long time.

**Q:** You work with the Population Crisis Commission; do you see this leading to a reduction in population growth in Europe? Do you agree with the conclusions of *Global 2000*?

**A:** German population is already at zero growth; in fact, I think it's sub-zero growth, as a result of this process. German population, European population generally, is not a problem. The most pressing population problem we have is in the Third World. India, China, Bangladesh, Africa, Latin America, still have populations increasing too fast, in spite of the fact that the world recession has reduced per capita income to \$150 per year. We've tried to teach them birth control, planned parenthood, it's been a failure. The process is too slow, the populations continue to grow. That's the *Global 2000* message.

**Q:** Hasn't the rise in oil prices affected population at all?

**A:** Certainly, it has helped a great deal, but not enough thus far. The price of oil bears absolutely no relation to the costs of production, and is hurting the LDCs tremendously. It's already caused a cataclysm in the Third World, they have lost any hope of developing whatsoever because of oil-price increases. Look at Turkey, every cent they have goes to pay the oil bill, they can't spend anything on industrialization.

**Q:** Is it causing population reduction?

**A:** Not yet, but it's causing sub-zero economic growth. There will be no growth, in fact, negative growth, in the Third World. That means fewer people.

**Q:** What will be Reagan's foreign economic policy toward the Third World?

**A:** None, as far as I can see. They don't feel it is their job. Their lack of foreign economic policy will mean that development in the Third World will be increasingly downhill. They seem content to let this happen. There is going to be negative economic growth in the Third World for the foreseeable future.

**Q:** Does this mean the Reagan administration has endorsed *Global 2000*?

**A:** I don't think they know what it means. They're simply not aware of the need to have a foreign economic policy.



---

## George Ball

---

*From an interview provided to EIR with George Ball, author of the 1976 book *Diplomacy in a Crowded World*, and senior partner in Lehman Brothers, Kuhn Loeb.*

**Q:** What has been the Reagan administration's response to Helmut Schmidt?

**A:** None. Germany will have to keep up interest rates as long as the administration feels it is necessary for U.S. domestic policy. Reagan feels U.S. policy comes first. This will cause great suffering in Germany, and a deep recession.

**Q:** Do you see Germany entering the postindustrial society as the U.S. has?

**A:** They are well on their way. They have declining productivity and they will have to live with the repercussions of U.S. credit tightening.

**Q:** But what is the Reagan administration's foreign economic policy toward Europe?

**A:** The administration has no foreign economic policy toward Europe, except El Salvador. Haig is the only person running foreign policy of any type as far as I can see, and no one is running foreign economic policy. Economic policy is being pushed aside. Haig is running everything, and he's not the least bit interested in Europe. All he cares about is fighting the Soviets in El Salvador, and challenging them generally in the Third World.

As a result, there is tremendous friction between the U.S. and Europe. I spoke to John J. McCloy the other day, he gave a speech at the Council on Foreign Rela-

tions three days ago, part of which was based on my recent *Foreign Affairs* piece. Jack is very depressed, he sees U.S.-German relations at an all-time low because of the total lack of Reagan administration concern for foreign economic conditions, and so do I. Unfortunately neither of us have close relations of any sort with the administration. There is not much we can do about it. Eagleburger might help, he knows his way around, but that guy from North Carolina is giving him trouble with his confirmation. There is no policy.

---

## John Oakes

---

John B. Oakes, former senior editor of the *New York Times*, in a recent interview made available to *EIR*, stated that he supports the ideas contained in the *Global 2000 Report* and states that OMB Director David Stockman used *Global 2000* as the basis for his proposed cuts in the U.S. budget. Oakes had authored an op-ed article in the *Times* Feb. 17 entitled "An Insecurity Budget" in which he wrote that the greatest threat to the United States's national security "springs from the unprecedented pressures of global population increase, worldwide resource depletion, and universal environmental degradation, menacing the security and stability of this and every other country. What is new and rapidly more dangerous, is the rate of population growth in the most impoverished countries; exhaustion of renewable resources in the most overpopulated countries, and susceptibility to demographic exploitation in the most underdeveloped countries. . . . [The] U.S. [must] contain these conditions and promote *sustainable* economic development in the Third World, as it does in not adding to the overkill capacity of [industry in] the First World [emphasis in original]."

In the subsequent interview, Oakes said, "I got most of my information for that editorial from [Global 2000] and its current update, *Global Future*. These two reports are extremely important, and we are concerned to advise the public of their findings in every way possible. Overpopulation in the Third World and overindustrialization in the industrial world are the greatest threats to our national security."

Oakes, in his article, intends to prevent such "overindustrialization" by supporting the cuts in infrastructure projects such as the Tenn-Tom waterway, the Red River waterway, the Central Arizona water project and the Mississippi River Lock and Dam 26. In the interview, Oakes complains that the budget does not cut deeply enough at these projects. He said, "I'm told by people close to him that Stockman, privately, is in complete agreement with these cuts I've proposed. He recognizes that they must be cut, for environmental as well as national security reasons and wants to push them through. I haven't asked Stockman about *Global 2000*, but I understand he is sympathetic to that as well."

Further, Oakes noted, "If Tenn-Tom were stopped today, there would be no further industrial development along the Tennessee Valley, which would reduce energy consumption. And there would be no further increase in population growth on the northern Mississippi. This would help."

---

## Sen. Charles Mathias

---

*The following excerpt is from a Feb. 27 speech by Sen. Charles Mathias, Jr. (R-Md.) to the Congressional Staff Forum on Food and International Development in Washington, D.C.*

The [Foreign Relations] Subcommittee [on International Economic Policy] hearings [Feb. 26-27] included the most sobering testimony on the interaction between poverty and population, and the effects of both on the earth's finite resources. The *Global 2000 Report*, issued in July after three years of research by more than a dozen government agencies, was equally sobering. It found the earth's resources severely strained through reckless exploitation to meet the economic demands of a growing world population.

The report projected a world in the year 2000 of 6.35 billion people, faced with a litany of woes: a wider gap between rich and poor; no increase in food consumption for most wood; loss of much of the world's farmland to erosion, salinization, and urbanization; shortages of fresh water; a 40 percent reduction in tropical forests; extinction of 20 percent of the species of plants and animals now living; increased acidity of rain and snowfall; rising carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere and decreasing ozone levels in the stratosphere; and a dangerous and expensive scramble by nations to secure dwindling stocks of energy and mineral resources.

The world depicted by the *Global 2000 Report* would be "more vulnerable to disruption than the world we live in now." It would seriously threaten the political and economic security of the United States. It would be a Hobbesian world: "red in tooth and claw."

It would be a serious mistake to dismiss *Global 2000* as just one more in a series of gloom and doom studies. The stunning fact about *Global 2000* is that it is based on conservative assumptions: "that the policies of governments and private companies stay much as they are today; that the technological advance continues at the same rate as in previous years, with no revolutionary breakthroughs; and that major wars and other catastrophes do not intervene."

*Global 2000*, in other words, assumes business as usual. It will all come to pass, as conservative columnist James J. Kilpatrick points out: "If we fail to heed the clear warnings of this study—if we fail to take sensible actions now. . . ."