
Profile

The U.S. systems analysis network

by Lonnie Wolfe

Not one policy decision of major consequence made by governments or corporate and financial circles in the West is not currently influenced by the cult practice known as systems analysis. The influence of this cult has proliferated especially during the past 20 years, spread by an army of thousands of analysts deployed through various think tanks in the United States and in Western Europe.

Overseeing this network is the London-based Tavistock Institute of Human Relations and its offshoot the Social Policy Research Unit at Sussex. Tavistock is the psychological warfare division of the British oligarchy and allied intelligence networks. It was Tavistock and their Central European allies who invented system theory as an appropriate brainwashing and conditioning mode for decision makers.

Tavistock provides the methodological framework and/or personnel for some of the key European centers of systems work. One of these, the Vienna-based International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), the coordinating point for systems theorists in both the East and the West, is a creation of the NATO-OECD networks that created the Club of Rome in 1969. Individuals such as Aurelio Peccei, Alexander King, and Eduard Pestel are members of both the international executive of the Club of Rome and the executive of IIASA, along with their Soviet counterparts, headed by Academician Dzhermen Gvishiani. Both IIASA and the Club of Rome control the work of the most important United Nations organizations such as the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (Unitar) through Club of Rome/IIASA member Ervin Laszlo.

The Club of Rome has produced two key global models over the last decade, both aimed at introducing "limits" or "scarcity" planning into the decision-making process. The first model produced in 1972, was the notorious Meadows-Forrester *Limits to Growth* model, which came under attack for being too arbitrary. In

fact, the model was deliberately extreme in its conclusions, so that a softer version of the same argument could be put out in another form, with greater public acceptability. The revision was initiated by Tavistock's Social Policy Research Unit (SPRU) and culminated in the mid-1970s Messerovic-Pestel model and subsequent revisions.

In the United States, the Tavistock networks (such as the Tavistock-trained Kurt Lewin) created the RAND Institute in Palo Alto, California as their core systems theory think tank and deployment center. RAND, spun out of the wartime Strategic Bombing Survey networks who later ran the Marshall Plan, moved personnel into every level of U.S. corporate and governmental circles during the 1950s and 1960s. For example, RAND systems analysis people virtually took over the U.S. Department of Defense during the tenure of Robert S. McNamara; RAND policy analysts remain ensconced there and in such agencies as the CIA, where former head of RAND Henry Rowan heads the policy analysis division.

The work of RAND is buttressed by other key systems analysis oriented think tanks, including SRI International (formerly Stanford Research Institute); the Battelle Memorial Institute (based in both Cleveland and Geneva, Switzerland, where its operations are directed by Club of Rome member Hugo Thiemann); the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, whose econometrics model is run by Club of Rome member Lawrence Klein; and the Sloan School of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), which employs Jay Forrester.

The invariant linking all these disparate operations is their common Tavistock-RAND parentage. For example, Eric Trist, the chairman of the editorial board of Tavistock's *Human Relations* magazine, formerly directed the Institute's North American operations from his base at Wharton, carefully interfacing the Wharton operation with Club of Rome networks. Personnel from RAND populate the systems analysis sections of these think tanks.

As is consistent with Tavistock methodology, an outsider examining this network might look at the various reports produced by these organizations and see an apparent conflict on certain levels between the groups. This competition is itself part of the brainwashing process; it masks the fact that all systems analysis applied on a large scale leads to limited variants of the same genocidal theme.

The think tanks have spinoffs within the private and government sectors themselves, such as the Chase Econometrics or the Defense Department Policy Analysis staff. Perhaps the most significant privately-based capacity is the futures forecasting groups of Shell Oil Company and the American Institute of Life Insurance.

These groups are in turn buttressed by a host of small

think tanks which perform specialized client work on futures studies. Among the most prominent of these is the Connecticut-based Futures Group, which specializes in forecasting and consensus brainwashing techniques based on the "Delphi method" developed by RAND. The Futures Group is formed from refugees from the Institute for the Future, which was set up by the European futures networks of such people as Alexander King and Eduard Pestel as well as RAND personnel from this country. The Futures Group, for example, designed the systems analysis model for long range planning used by the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Occasionally these networks are pulled together under a single project to build a global model. This was precisely how the *Global 2000 Report* was produced, under the auspices of the Carter State Department from 1977 to 1980, under the direction of IIASA/Club of Rome member Gerald O. Barney, and the White House Council on Environmental Quality.

The next step

The policy networks behind the *Global 2000 Report* are now moving all policy channels into a single systems-analysis-based network.

The Committee for the Year 2000, the elite group of prominent individuals and former government officials who back global depopulation policies, are plotting a de facto coup against U.S. constitutional government, to force all policy decision to be made from the same global systems analysis framework that produced the *Global 2000 Report*.

According to a spokesman, the Committee whose membership includes Club of Rome members Robert O. Anderson of Arco, Russell Train of the World Wildlife Fund, and Lester Brown of Worldwatch as well as former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, has "decided to change the way that government functions and makes decisions. This means we will have to ignore certain constitutional considerations and look the other way to get things done."

Following a secret meeting in Washington last month, Anderson informed the staff of the Committee that they had decided to skip over particular issues . . . and go for what we think is more crucial. We need to create an institutional capability based on global systems analysis within the U.S. government to produce and implement future policy forecasts. We want all decisions based on this. In this way we control the process of decision making."

The committee has yet to elaborate a precise proposal. This will come after another secret session in January. The committee spokesman described the problem of formulating a workable proposal as "extremely sensitive, especially when you get to areas of congressional and executive responsibility for implementing policy

based on such a model. The critical function is oversight, making sure that the policy proceeds from here. . . ."

"The concept of the global model carries with it a language all its own," said a Committee source about the brainwashing mode behind their plan and all systems analysis. "It is easier to convey a positive image around otherwise harsh ideas with systems analysis. The *Global 2000 Report* failed to communicate this properly—it lacked positive language. It was a good try, an important effort, but it couldn't produce a good report because the government wasn't organized properly to produce a good job. There was nothing wrong with the systems model as such."

The Committee thinks that it can trap sections of the Reagan administration into going along with the project by asserting that systems analysis has no bias. They openly admit that this is a trap—that, no matter how the information is assembled or who does it, the results will lead toward the conclusion that population reduction at some level is necessary. They are willing, for example, to work with Herman Kahn of the Hudson Institute, another systems think tank with a "pro-growth" cover—if that pleases the White House. They know that Kahn's modelling is *essentially* the same as the Club of Rome's.

"We want to produce a new and better *Global 2000*," said a Committee spokesman. "It will make the same conclusions, use the same methods, but be unassailable. We will use the systems language better."

IRIS

A second, perhaps further-reaching consolidation of this network is taking place around the formation of a new private intelligence agency, International Reporting Information Systems or as it is more commonly known, IRIS. This new organization will use a computer data base larger than the CIA's, and boast of an extensive network of intelligence-gathers and former CIA agents.

IRIS will place a computer video terminal in the offices of each client, who will then be plugged into the central computer and will receive daily intelligence reports, futures forecasts, and risk analyses tailored to their requests. In that way IRIS will draw the policy makers of the leading corporations, banking institutions and government agencies around the world into a single systems-analysis data base. In that way IRIS's "impartial" risk analysis of various countries becomes the basis for investment decisions.

IRIS, which boasts former British Prime Minister and Brandt Commission member Ted Heath as chairman of its advisory board and Robert McNamara as a board member, believes that it can feed every policy assumption that counts into the system.