

## **EIR** Special Report

# Global 2000 debate out in the open

by Vin Berg

Nicholas Yost, one of the principal architects of the *Global 2000 Report to the President*, was challenged by Uwe Parpart, research director for the Fusion Energy Foundation, at a public debate at the Washington Hilton Hotel on May 20. The debate, one of a series of seminars on critical international issues sponsored by *EIR* this year, is expected to have an important effect on the political climate surrounding the Reagan administration, which has so far failed to break with its predecessor on vital questions of international economic development.

About 20 embassies sent ambassadors and economic attachés to the debate, representing the industrialized sector, the East bloc, and particularly Third World nations. Academic specialists, corporate executives, and congressional staff were also in attendance, along with officials of the World Bank and Inter-American Development Bank. From the U.S. executive branch, there was particularly strong attendance by the Defense, State, and Agriculture Departments, along with Labor, Defense, Commerce, Interior, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the congressional Government Accounting Office, the Bureau of the Census, and the Export-Import Bank.

The *Global 2000* document is at present the leading study circulating in support of those inside and outside government who argue that the only solution to energy shortages, resource shortages, and "general strains on the environment," is reduction of world population by roughly 2 billion persons by the year 2000, "by any means necessary."

Nicholas Yost, whose father Charles was a senior State Department planner, acted as chief counsel to the White House Council on Environmental Quality under Jimmy Carter. The CEQ and the Carter State Department issued the *Global 2000* and *Global Futures* reports. Nicholas Yost coordinated the Global Futures task force responsible for the second report.

In the afternoon session, His Excellency Mr. Youssoufou Oumarou, U.N. Ambassador of the Organization of African Unity, indicated the impact the event was having on Third World representatives present. Oumarou told the



Stuart Lewis/NSIPS

*At the debate: a challenge to Malthusianism.*

audience: “The biggest problem in Africa is economic development. The people who wrote *Global 2000* don’t know anything about Africa. Let me tell you why we Africans came to the United States. We came because of your agriculture. The U.S. is the country which has been successful in agriculture, and that is what we are looking for. You have two choices in Africa. You can either spend your time trying to reduce your population, or you can try to increase your gross national product and your food production.”

*Global 2000*’s authors are candid in private conversations concerning their goals—genocide in the Third World. But they are aware that this policy cannot be sold to Americans without extensive psychological “shock treatment.” Numerous individuals associated with the report have confided that their tactics are to create “debate and discussion” around the report’s projections and proposals.

Essential to the tactic is successfully excluding consideration of the obvious alternative—massive deployment of scientific knowhow, nuclear power, and advanced technologies for industrial and agricultural development in the Third World regions.

Yost adopted a debating posture consistent with such tactics. He presented the *Global 2000* report as simply a “statement of problems.”

Parpart—coauthor of long-term development program proposals for Mexico and India—at the outset, zeroed in on Yost’s presumed neutrality, exposing the fact that the *Global 2000* report had not been written in a

“policy vacuum,” but in an environment of zero-growth ideology, by individuals fully subscribing to that Malthusian ideology. The report’s unstated assumptions, “no change in investment flows, no change in policies of restricting nuclear and other technologies’ transfer to the Third World, no change at all in present policies,” were brought out in public.

Yost was hard pressed to continue representing *Global 2000* as merely a kind of humanitarian “early-warning system.” He mentioned only in passing that all technological advances were indeed excluded from *Global 2000*’s 20-year projection, using the phrase, “barring a revolution in technology.” He emphasized the skewed result: crises in water resources, energy shortages, and excessive population growth, concluding that “Our national security is closely tied to the global interrelationship of population, energy and environment.” During the rebuttal session, Yost rose to the spirited defense of the World Bank.

His Malthusian outlook had ill prepared him for Parpart’s factual scientific contention: “There is absolutely no correlation between population growth and resource availability per capita.” The Fusion Energy Foundation spokesman established that the human resource base correlates only with human technology. Provided we do develop, assimilate, and diffuse available technologies and those already within sight of development, Parpart ended his rebuttal, “one of the greatest shortages we could have by the year 2000 is a shortage of people capable of engaging in the production process.”