

population growth rates are too low for continued economic development. But as an advanced nation Japan's new policy may have greater repercussions elsewhere.

The Population Problems Council statement was issued immediately after Dr. Bardwell's attack on *Global 2000*, entitled "The World Needs More People," appeared in the 100,000-circulation Japanese science magazine *Cosmos*.

In the United States, the battle against *Global 2000* was launched in Washington, D.C. by two conferences of the Fusion Energy Foundation (FEF) and *Executive Intelligence Review* in May 1981.

On May 13 Dr. Bardwell and Uwe Parpart, FEF Director of Research, were joined by former Rep. Mike McCormack in presentations to 130 representatives largely of government and embassies, on the potential for qualitative expansion of the resource base available to human population through fusion energy development. The following week many of the same individuals and others from government and private thinktanks in the capital, attended a debate between Parpart and *Global 2000 Report* co-author Nicholas Yost, Jr. The debate's result was unquestionable, even to Yost's colleagues in the audience.

During that debate (see *EIR*, June 9, 1981) Parpart noted,

When a cow is born today, we consider ourselves richer. But when a human child is born, we are said to be poorer as a result. This situation is intolerable. This is the situation which must be changed.

Parpart's remarks were later widely quoted in the journals and newsletters of pro-life organizations in the United States. Two months later the Fusion Energy Foundation released the Bardwell article debunking *Global 2000* in *Fusion* magazine, at a United Nations press conference. As news coverage of the article intersected its broad international circulation, LaRouche's forces in the National Democratic Policy Committee began a major campaign in defense of Chicago's Cardinal Cody, against the schismatics seeking to depose him as part of an effort to split the American church from Rome on the "population question."

LaRouche exposed the direct links of the schismatics and Jesuits to the Planned Parenthood and Ford Foundation elite (McGeorge Bundy, Stephen Mumford) who were openly hoping for the death of the Pope, and to the "back-to-nature" cultists of the Anglican Church anthroposophic heresies.

In September the American Life Lobby newsletter published an extensive and thorough attack on the *Global 2000 Report*, drawing on material from *Fusion* and *Executive Intelligence Review*. The establishment of a "common language" for purposes of identifying the enemy has raised the potential among LaRouche's forces and a

wide range of religious groupings for joint initiatives against *Global 2000*'s implementation.

This potential is being tested by the fight to overturn the Washington, D.C. Act 4-115, the "Natural Death Act of 1981." The groups mobilized against the death bill include black Baptist ministers, Roman Catholic priests, the National Catholic Physicians Association, the American Life Lobby, National Black Women's Political Caucus, area Jewish leaders and the local chapter of Moral Majority, the National Democratic Policy Committee, national Anti-Drug Coalition, and state and local chapters of pro-life groups who have offered support in moving Congressmen to stop the law from taking effect.

With the January resumption of Congress, "petitions of disapproval" of the death act will be introduced—not at all the manner in which the Club of Rome, Population Crisis Committee, and their ilk wished to see the congressional debate on *Global 2000* formally begin.

LaRouche will present a major address in New York Dec. 31, "More Evil Than Adolf Hitler: The Genocide of Carter's *Global 2000* and *Global Futures Policies*." Close to a thousand people are expected to hear the presentation.

## U.S. Malthusians

# Global 2000 shifts rhetorical gears

by Lonnie Wolfe

In early January 1981, a spokesman for the Population Crisis Committee/Draper Fund, the group acknowledged to be the most powerful of the advocates of global population reduction, offered the following assessment of the upcoming year: "If we had our preference, we would certainly have wanted Jimmy Carter to stay in office. But I think you'll be surprised about how much influence our ideas will have in the policy considerations of the new administration. We'll make the transition."

Looking back over the year, this assessment has proved correct.

Carter administration policy was controlled by the genocide lobby from the highest levels. Exerting their influence through Secretary of State Vance and National Security Adviser Brzezinski, they organized the administration to produce a blueprint for the next 20 years—

the *Global 2000 Report* released in July 1980, and its follow-up, *Global Futures*, released in January 1981.

Global 2000 was the effective updating of the original zero-growth document, the Club of Rome's *Limits to Growth* report. If its policy-planning assumptions are accepted, then the United States is committed the reduction of the world population levels by upwards of two billion people by the turn of the century.

Statements by Carter administration officials such as Assistant Secretary of State Thomas Pickering make it clear that the *Global 2000 Report* would have been the key international planning document for a second Carter administration.

According to sources close to Henry Kissinger at Georgetown University, *Global 2000*, tainted as it was with environmentalist rhetoric and no-growth arguments, could never be openly accepted by the new administration. As Reagan took his oath of office, the Kissinger crowd was busy reworking *Global 2000* as national-security doctrine.

Just before the inauguration, a meeting of several hundred environmentalists and population-reduction advocates was convened in Washington under the auspices of the Audubon Society, to make plans for dealing with the Reagan administration. They decided to create a coordinated lobby to push for their ideas in whatever form they could be effectively marketed. Five months later, this grouping reconstituted itself as the Global Tomorrow Coalition, an umbrella lobby of more than 25 groups, including the Population Crisis Committee (PCC).

Meanwhile, an elite group of former government officials and so-called prominent citizens, the Committee for the Year 2000, was created by these networks with the express purpose of selling the global population-reduction doctrine of Global 2000 to the conservatives inside the administration and the business community. The Committee included GOP environmentalists like Russell Train (currently heading the World Wildlife Fund), former Nixon cabinet member Elliot Richardson, and Arco chairman Robert O. Anderson of the Aspen Institute, as well as Cyrus Vance. The group has been quietly lobbying with Reagan administration officials for "global futures planning" and the creation of an "improved" global model.

The March meeting of the U.S. Association for the Club of Rome gave a clear public indication that a shift in emphasis and language had indeed taken place. The Club of Rome, created by the NATO command in the late 1960s, is synonymous with the doomsday predictions of the *Limits to Growth* report. But at this meeting, Club members were told that to be effective with the new administration, they would have to sell their genocidal ideas in an "upbeat" fashion. A new book, commissioned especially for the American audience, was titled *Making*

*It Happen*.

The spokesmen for such groups as the PCC privately speak of important covert supporters, such as Secretary of State Haig, his undersecretaries Myer Rashish and James Buckley, State's Population Affairs bureau, as well as the outspoken Peter McPherson, director of the Agency for International Development (AID). They also mention Budget Director David Stockman, along with figures in Treasury and Commerce.

These officials, collaborating with members of the Committee for the Year 2000 and the PCC, have designed Reagan administration policy to accomplish the objectives of Global 2000. Commenting on the global austerity policies endorsed by the Reagan administration, Phyllis Piotrow, former director of the PCC, said with satisfaction in an October interview, "Mortality rates will go up."

Domestically, a parallel phenomenon is taking place. The Stockman budget-cut program will reduce U.S. population growth. A Club of Rome spokesman said that cuts in welfare and social security will cause "poor" people to die but termed the cuts necessary. Stockman, meanwhile, while cutting funds for a myriad of social support programs, managed to increase funding for international population-control programs from \$190 million under Carter to \$211 million in FY 1982.

Twice this year, these covert supporters of Global 2000 have worked to undermine potential Reagan administration collaboration with the developing sector and bring policy in

First, the State Department and Treasury Department worked overtime to keep the United States behind International Monetary Fund austerity policies as the July 19 Ottawa summit of industrial nations approached; and they helped gain Reagan administration support for a provision of the Ottawa communiqué terming population growth in the developing sector a problem.

Following the Ottawa summit, Rashish and Robert Hormats in State, along with their counterparts in Treasury, moved to lock the administration into support for a "free-market" approach to the developing sector and a re-affirmation of support for IMF austerity in advance of the October Cancún North-South summit. This policy was enunciated in an October speech drafted by Rashish, Hormats et al., and delivered to the Philadelphia World Affairs Council. The speech, which included a call to cut Third World food subsidies, was repeated by Reagan at the Cancún summit.

Just prior to the summit, Garrett Hardin, an outspoken supporter of population-reduction policies, reported that the Reagan free-market approach to the developing sector would wind up reducing population levels at a faster rate than any contraceptive program. Support for IMF policies, said Hardin, meant support

for what he termed "lifeboat economics"—writing off whole sections of the developing sector.

The January Audubon leadership conference had discussed the importance of using Congress to put pressure on the White House, while giving support to sympathizers inside the administration.

Immediately afterward, Rep. Richard Ottinger (D-N.Y.) introduced legislation committing the United States to support policies of zero population growth worldwide. The legislation, HR 907, had preliminary hearings in April. But the bill drew considerable fire, with Ottinger being branded as a genocide merchant, and it remains bottled up in committee. In June, Sen. Charles Mathias, a senior GOP member of the Foreign Relations Committee, sent a letter to President Reagan co-signed by 84 Senators and Congressmen, demanding that the administration move on the policy recommendations of the *Global Futures* report.

The reply letter reported that the administration would soon begin its own study of problems raised by Global 2000. In November a task force was put together under the direction of State Department operatives around James Buckley and the Council on Environmental Quality. Sources close to the project say that plans are to cast the new report "in national security and free-market language that the White House will understand."

In late October, Sen. Mark Hatfield (R-Ore.), chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, introduced legislation that would create a mechanism in the executive branch to study all U.S. long-range policy from a Global 2000 "systems" approach. The bill, S-1771, like the Ottinger legislation, would commit the United States to a zero population growth policy, both domestically and internationally. The genocide lobby views the Hatfield bill as the "most significant piece of population legislation ever introduced into Congress." They point out that for the first time they have secured support from prominent Democrats and Republicans, giving it a chance for passage next year. Sources report that in October, Myer Rashish's crew at the State Department drew up a hit list of developing-sector countries whose "unstable populations" will cause political unrest. Rashish's group recommends that the United States prepare to write off these countries, seek other sources of strategic materials, and prepare to contain the political and social turmoil. In late February, sources in the State Department's Office of Population Affairs confirmed that the Haig State Department was in fact running the El Salvador civil war as a depopulation war, and laid out in detail how such a war would be used to depopulate countries. Thomas Ferguson of the State Department told reporters in February that El Salvador had an exceptional fertile population

that resisted population control methods. The civil war would reduce the child-bearing population, he said.

In the critical area of defense policy, the promoters of the Global 2000 doctrine have increasingly held sway, despite the Reagan administration's talk of restoring American military power. The purported "military buildup" has in fact served repeatedly as a fairly effective cover for restructuring the U.S. military into a Roman Empire-modeled imperial army designed to enforce the Global 2000 policy.

The stated policy objectives of Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger are, in their essential strategic features, those long advocated by Gen. Maxwell Taylor, who along with Robert McNamara oversaw the conduct of the protracted Vietnam War as a "body-count" population war. The core of Taylor's doctrine, which he ensured was repeatedly injected into debate over defense policy and the defense budget during 1981, is that the primary strategic theater has shifted from Central Europe to the developing sector, particularly areas such as the Persian Gulf, Africa, and Latin America. One of the inspirers of Global 2000, Taylor cites the "overpopulation" of the Third World and resultant competition for increasingly scarce resources as grounds for expecting wars in the developing sector, and thus for shifting U.S. military capabilities away from strategic, in-depth war-fighting and into more primitively equipped (and less costly) "conventional" forces much like the marauding legions of the Roman army or Britain's 19th-century colonial forces.

As *EIR* documented on numerous occasions this year, the official defense guidances issued by Secretary Weinberger to the armed services conform precisely to Maxwell Taylor's doctrine, aimed at retooling the U.S. military to enforce genocidal population wars in the Third World. The code rationale, in effect, for asserting the priority for such marauding shock troops, is the Reagan administration's promotion of Jimmy Carter's Rapid Deployment Force (RDF) as an accelerated response capability to "hot spot" crises *beyond* the NATO theater.

The Weinberger guidances, reiterated in the fall after the administration decided to leave the issue of new strategic weapons substantially unresolved, would make this restructuring-for-genocide of the U.S. military virtually irreversible. The armed services have been instructed to design their forces through the late 1980s in accordance with the main strategic theater, and that they must prepare instead to fight multiple "small" wars throughout the developing sector. Consequently, more of what remains of U.S. fighting capabilities is to be cannibalized for "no-win" operations conducted by units like the RDF, which Weinberger has recently designated an even higher priority.