
Interview

Global 2000 author Gerald Barney praises Fidel Castro and Mexico's CP

by Lonnie Wolfe

The project director for the Carter administration's *Global 2000 Report*, Gerald Barney, has been traveling around the world since the report was released last July, in an effort to establish Global 2000 projects in major countries. Under former Rockefeller Fund executive Barney's direction, the report concluded that world population estimated for the year 2000 must be cut by some 2 billion people. Barney's stops have included most of Western Europe, Japan, Canada, Panama, Mexico, and the People's Republic of China; he plans a trip soon to Poland.

In a recent interview, excerpted below, Barney stressed that Fidel Castro praised the *Global 2000 Report* in a September 1980 speech in Havana before the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization regional meeting.

Barney also emphasized the existence of "professionals" within the Reagan executive branch whom he counts on to maintain the Global 2000 push. The State Department, as *EIR* has documented, remains a center of specialists in mass murder, who under Alexander Haig are now actively promoting the Global 2000 documents among Third World embassies, according to diplomatic sources in Washington. The State Department officially denies that Global 2000's approach of "hit lists" for population reduction is its policy, but the net effect of State's pressure campaign is to legitimize and promote the doctrine of genocide.

Private consultants operating under the State Department, often using U.S. embassy facilities, are using computer displays to bring Global 2000 psychological warfare to Third World officials from planners to heads of state, to complement Barney's work.

From an April interview with Gerald Barney provided to EIR:

Q: Had the Carter administration stayed in office, your report would have been a centerpiece of policy. But now that we have a new administration, what happens?

A: There are a number of people in the new administration who think this is very important stuff. And there's at least one conservative columnist who thinks it's pretty important. James Kilpatrick wrote an article in *Nation's Business* that this is one of the most important things

around, a liberal conspiracy. . . . This new administration is not dumb; there are some smart people there. A smart person knows, without much coaching, that there are a lot of problems with population growth. A smart person also knows that there isn't any simple solution to the world's energy problems. And a smart person also knows that there's a limited amount of additional land that can be brought under cultivation. A smart person also knows that right here in the United States we're feeling the effects of the cost of fertilizer and other energy-intensive inputs into agriculture, and that our soils are eroding in a way that is not very satisfactory. It also doesn't take a very smart person to know that the financial institutions of the world, particularly the international banks, are on very shaky ground. And while a number of people have gone out of their way to be critical of this report, the fact is that report is not *my* opinion; that report is the best professional analysis that professionals within the U.S. government are able to do today.

Q: If the Reagan administration did the same kind of report would they arrive at the same conclusions?

A: Absolutely. There's not one of the professional people who did that work who were so concerned with the change of the administration. Those are career civil servants, the most professional the government's got, and they are dealing with global issues. Those people are all still right there. Most of them are doing the same work they were doing before. It's the government's own data. . . . There are some things wrong with it. In the second volume we describe a lot of things that are wrong. But my overwhelming impression is that if you corrected those problems, in the final analysis the picture of the world's problems would be grimmer, not more happy.

Q: People believe, especially in the aftermath of the Space Shuttle's success, that science and technology can solve almost everything, and that if we continue to apply ourselves, our scientific genius, that there is not going to be a big problem with scarce resources or energy.

A: Well, I'd answer first of all by saying that the Global 2000 study assumes that technology is going to do a whale of a lot already. Agricultural yields are projected to increase at a rate which is essentially identical with the

rate of increase during the height of the "Green Revolution." Now we don't have technologies on hand to do that. If that doesn't happen the situation is going to be far worse than projected in that report.

It has also been projected or assumed in that report that there are going to be developments in nuclear energy that are going to make nuclear energy completely acceptable, such that nuclear power would triple over a 15-year period, that's a pretty rapid increase in nuclear power throughout the world. . . . The most serious problems that are talked about in there like population I don't know of any way that technology's really going to help.

Q: Isn't this a neo-Malthusian argument?

A: I think that technology may solve some of the problems, but not in time. I would not want to call Global 2000 neo-Malthusian. I would call it an econometric/ecological analysis. Most of the analysis that was done was done with econometric tools allowing for the market-clearing mechanism to play a full role. These are not just linear projections, they are nonlinear, and very sophisticated. . . . Global 2000 does use the geometric argument which is tied into the Malthusian viewpoint, but I would not want to apply that term to the study. If we used it, it creates an automatic-type freakout, and people wouldn't look at the study.

Q: What are the prospects for a country like Mexico implementing Global 2000?

A: I've been to quite a number of countries—Mexico, Panama, quite a number of countries in Europe, Australia, Japan, China, and Poland. In all of those countries, I've found very strong interest in Global 2000, stronger than in the U.S. . . .

I was only in Mexico for about a week, but I found very strong interest there, especially among the Ceestem people [a U.N. spinoff]. I was set up to debate a Marxist professor, one linked to the CP, and after I spoke, there wasn't a debate. He said that Global 2000 was a very fair assessment. . . .

Q: You are saying it has Marxist support?

A: Well, Fidel Castro gave a speech in Havana a few months back to the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization about the Global 2000 report. He supported it. He faulted us merely because in both Spanish and Russian the word "global" translates into "all-encompassing," rather than as we mean it, in the more geographic sense. Both Castro and the Soviets faulted us mostly because the report was not all-encompassing and it did not include a discussion of the arms race. But beyond that, Castro supported us. A very substantial part of his speech was basically quotes from the study. He said that he thought it was very important that the United States had done this, that he agreed with the conclusions, and felt that it would require a period of unprecedented cooper-

ation among nations to deal with the problems in the Global 2000 report. Castro does understand the population question. Look at the way he handled the boat people migration. He sent away his surplus people. "Want some more?" he says. "We have some more for you."

Q: Let's go back to Mexico for a moment. Mexico seems committed to U.S.-style industrial development.

A: You have to be very precise when you talk about American-style industrial growth. I don't really think that Mexico sees it that way. They have substantial wealth in oil but they have tremendous problems. One of the biggest is overurbanization. People are finding things so bad in the countryside that they are flocking to the cities. There is every reason to think that Mexico City will be the largest city in the world by the year 2000—30 million people or more. The basin on which the city is located is already in bad shape. Water is not potable. The pollution is so bad that it is affecting the ground water. . . .

Q: What would you tell them to do?

A: First of all, I would say that the government is going to be increasingly vulnerable to destabilization. This is not only because of the problems I described. People in Mexico didn't expect to get everything from their oil wealth, but they didn't expect to get poorer. But that is what happened. Wages have not gone up. They have been cut down very deliberately. Inflation is going up at 100 percent or more per year. As a result, the power of what little there is is dropping greatly. And that is a very politically unstable situation. There is a potential for a lot of unrest in Mexico for a very long time which the government of López Portillo or any government will become aware of. . . .

Beyond that, they have to develop their water. You must have a strategy to deal with the food. They have one but it may not work. They must find some way to take pressure off the cities. . . .

Q: Is there a constituency for Global 2000?

A: There is very definitely a constituency for it. Are you familiar with the science philosopher Thomas Kuhn? He talks about paradigms, which are macro, mental constructs of scientific thought that are appropriate for a particular period. They are revolutionary ways of looking at the world. Newton had one paradigm. Einstein had quite a different one. I would say that the world as a whole is going through a major paradigm shift right now. For a long time, people thought that technology could solve everything and that growth could go on indefinitely. . . . This is a whole new view of the world. This is the view of Global 2000.

I see the constituency developing before our eyes.