

Stockman's link to Global 2000

The OMB director has worked on 'population control,' and his budget for AID reflects that outlook, documents Lonnie Wolfe.

Office of Management and Budget Director David Stockman has quietly engineered a major funding increase in the State Department's international population programs. These are the core programs for carrying out the Carter administration's Global 2000 perspective of reducing by 2 billion people the turn-of-the-century world population.

According to documents submitted to Congress by the State Department, the Stockman-prepared budget for FY 1982 pegs funding of international population programs at \$253.4 billion, or a 33 percent increase over the Carter FY 1981 budget line of \$190 million. The funding goes for "family planning" programs in more than 20 countries. Spokesmen for the Agency for International Development (AID), which administers the programs, say that this translates into a whole range of contraceptive and sterilization programs aimed at reducing fertility rates.

These programs, run by State Department Coordinator for Population Affairs Richard Benedict through AID, are an essential component of the Global 2000 machine operating within State. Population control programs, in the view of this group, are a foot in the door for dictating "life-and-death" decisions for the Third World. These are the planners who not only want to prevent future births, but are committed to exterminating millions already alive.

Stockman's past

Less than a month ago, spokesmen for the population programs at State "optimistically" looked forward to funding for FY 1982 at \$220 million. This, they thought, was the maximum "that could be snuck by the White House." But these aides were not counting on the power of Budget Director David Stockman. While Stockman "keeps the issue of population at arm's length now," according to former associate Michael Teitelbaum, director of the Population Office at the Ford Foundation, Stockman's budget is "only putting into practice the work that he did during the 1970s."

Omitted from all references in former student radical

Stockman's official "born-again" conservative biography is the fact that as a freshman congressman from Michigan, Stockman was one of the leaders of the despised House Select Committee on Population Affairs in 1977-79. The committee, headed by zero-growth advocate James Scheuer of New York, was set up at the instigation of the Population Crisis Committee/Draper Fund, whose directors are committed to the Malthusian world view of Global 2000. It was mandated to "investigate world population growth and the U.S. role in meeting this challenge, as well as to assess population trends in the U.S. and the need for additional policies."

Stockman cochaired the committee task force on "Domestic Consequences of U.S. Population Change." This group made long-range proposals for shaping U.S. budget policy to reduce the population in the U.S. According to Teitelbaum, the former chief of staff of the committee, Stockman's task-force recommendations are contained in his 1982 slash-and-burn U.S. budget.

"Dave was particularly concerned with overspending on internal improvements such as water projects, highways, utilities, and other infrastructure," said Teitelbaum, "because such projects create population that wasn't there."

Jimmy Carter's water project plan, which galvanized the Congress against him in 1978, was lifted almost whole from the Select Committee study, according to Teitelbaum. So are most Environmental Protection Agency regulations limiting local authorities in their requests for water and other projects on the ground of "environmental impact," he boasted. As OMB director, Stockman now proposes to slash 20 percent of all U.S. water project funding.

The Stockman task force also proposed that America's entry into a zero-population-growth society necessitates a budgetary shift to deal with a higher percentile of elderly and a falling percentile of children. "More elderly on top of a shrinking workforce means that we will have some hard decisions to make about reducing Social Security payments and raising the retirement age," said Teitelbaum.

According to Len Rogers, a spokesman for AID, Stockman, working with OMB International Division chief Phillip Dussault, told AID acting director Peter McPherson to come up with an amount for the population programs, but to scale it down somewhat to keep it within the budget-cutting profile of OMB. This would make it easier to sell to the White House. Working with Dussault, a member of the National Security Council's Ad Hoc Group on Population Policy—the agency that evaluates the population programs and assigns “targets”—McPherson came up with the \$253.4 million figure.

Stockman in fact proposed several cuts in AID programs. The most notable was to a key program that keeps people alive. The FY 1982 budget draft contains a conspicuous \$22 million cut in AID's primary health-care program, which is aimed at reducing mortality rates in the developing sector, especially among young children. Funding is to be reduced from \$142 million to \$120 million.

“Sure, this cut will mean that more people will die,” said an AID spokesman. “But Stockman's budget says we can't save everybody.” AID spokesmen could offer no real explanation of why money was found for expanding the population-reduction program and cuts were made in the health-care program. “It is a policy decision,” said the spokesman. Asked about support for the Global 2000 doctrine, he replied, “Let us say that our support must be covert for the time being. We wouldn't want to antagonize the White House.”

The funding increase for the population programs as well as the cuts in the primary health-care aid were contained in the Senate budget resolution passed last week. The budget must now be reviewed line by line by various House and Senate committees.

The backers of Global 2000 are worried about possible congressional opposition and are lining up support. Their “point person” will be Sen. Charles Percy of Illinois, an outspoken environmentalist and a delegate to the Club of Rome's 1974 Bucharest World Population Conference.

Senator Jesse Helms of North Carolina has promised publicly and loudly that he would lead a fight to delete funding for the population programs. But his office seems unaware of what Stockman has done with that portion of the budget. A leading spokesman for the pro-life groups that back Helms say that they have been “promised” by McPherson that “none of the money” allocated for the population programs will be spent on population reduction—a statement as untrue as it is naive.

What really worries the Global 2000 backers at State is that “the Reagan White House will suddenly wake up and junk the whole thing,” said an AID spokesman. “I really don't know how we've gotten this far.”

Documentation

From AID's McPherson

The following is excerpted from testimony by M. Peter McPherson, the administrator of the Agency for International Development (AID), before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on April 1.

According to sources at AID, McPherson's statements had the approval of Assistant Secretary of State James Buckley and other officials. The AID sources say that McPherson is “very positive” toward the Global 2000 report and that his statements on the population crisis “might as well be lifted directly from Global 2000.”

In the past year public awareness of our interdependence has been highlighted by the President's Hunger Commission, the Brandt Commission, and the Global 2000 study. The Global 2000 report in particular presents a sobering picture of large-scale, interrelated problems caused by population growth, energy scarcity, forest destruction with attendant soil and atmospheric effects, and pressure on food production capacity. . . .

Rapid population growth in developing countries exacerbates food, environment, and energy problems. Between 1980 and the year 2000, the world's population is expected to increase from about 4.5 billion to over 6.3 billion people; 90 percent of that increase will take place in the developing countries. While the demographic situation is serious, it is not hopeless. Worldwide population growth rates are no longer rising. Among the 12 most populous developing countries, all have experienced crude birth-rate declines. However, significant countries and regions of the developing world are still growing at rapid rates that offset development gains and contribute to local and global instability.

As the largest donor for international population programs, the United States has played an important part in bringing about decreased population growth rates. We have led in developing and disseminating the most widely used contraceptive methods; in providing contraceptives; in developing inexpensive service delivery systems; in training personnel; and [in] increasing motivation for family planning among individuals, communities, and national leaders.

We must continue to assert our leadership. Today, demand for population programs far exceeds available resources. Our funding request of \$253.4 million for population programs is essential to keep up the momentum in the highest priority program areas.