

spread to the rest of the Third World.

If Americans examine, in any number of available newspaper accounts, the current statements of the U.S. State Department and other agencies on relations with the Third World, it becomes obvious what the British have achieved in recent months: they have turned the United States into a loudmouthed proponent of starvation through the rhetoric of "free enterprise." "Cut back food subsidies; cease financing exports with government funds; learn to pay your bills through diligence," and then, on occasion, "reduce your populations" are all that the U.S. administration has had to say on this subject since approximately May of this year.

Relative to the United States' loudmouthed, abrasive behavior, the British have been quiet. Prime Minister Thatcher plays the "free enterprise" role, but since Lord Carrington runs the Commonwealth department, she is not obliged to say anything specific on these matters. The Queen of England, the royal family of Britain, London's banks and raw-materials extraction conglomerates are quietly watching the theater they have set up from backstage, hoping nobody notices the dragon and St. George sailing for U.S. shores across the Atlantic Ocean.

British Commonwealth Chain of Command

Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II
Lord Maclean, Chamberlain of the Royal Household

Political Chiefs

Lord Carrington, Foreign Minister
Sir Ian Gilmour, Lord Privy Seal

Permanent Officials of the Foreign Office

Lord Nicholas Gordon Lennox
(Information, Culture, Coordination of Commonwealth
United Nations Policy for All Commonwealth Countries)
Sir Michael Palliser
(Diplomacy, Historical Continuity of Policy)
W. J. Adams
(Finance, Security, Manpower)

Commonwealth Secretariat, High Commissioners

Shridath Ramphal

Think Tanks

Institute for Development Studies, University of Sussex
Commonwealth Studies Institute, Oxford University
Overseas Development Group, University of East Anglia
North-South Institute, Ottawa, Canada

The method by which agents of influence—

If the Third World countries that have received the Brandt Commission's North-South report with "an open mind" knew that one of their deadly enemies, Henry Kissinger, and the Aspen Institute's population fanatics Harlan Cleveland and Joseph Slater are the minds who put that work together, Willy Brandt, the Second International, and his "independent" commissioners would stand totally exposed.

If these countries further realized that Commonwealth Secretary-General Sir Shridath Ramphal, one of Kissinger's dear friends and a Brandt commissioner, meets every month with the Queen of England and her Foreign Office to map out the next step of the Brandt Commission's destabilization operations, the Third World would realize that the Brandt Commission's goals are an ill-disguised maneuver to reimpose colonial oppression in its crudest, most brutal form.

We shall show in this exposé that the Brandt Commission's activities and those of its friends in high places are implementing the tail-end of a policy, British in conception, British in its chain of command, and British in its strategic interests, which is opposed to the national sovereignty of both Third World and developed nations. Accompanying charts and interviews show conclusively that the Brandt report, officially titled the *Report of the Independent Commission on International Development Issues*, is not merely the compilation of ideas of some two dozen zero-growth ideologues, but the work of many of the key "North" and "South" people in economic, political, financial, and monetary spheres to uphold the interests of the British Crown. Once this is understood as a crucial part of post-World War II history, it is no longer a surprise to find Third World "leftists" seated in British-based Commonwealth "development" institutes working intimately with Henry Kissinger and Robert McNamara in producing blueprints such as the Brandt report.

British imperial interests, as they bear directly on the Brandt report, have been represented in the postwar period by three supranational institutions: 1) the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF); 2) the parallel North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) military structure, whose extension across the Third

Britain generates its Brandt's commission

World to defend British interests is now being promoted, and NATO's creation of the Club of Rome; 3) the Brandt Commission.

I. The World Bank hoax

From the economic and financial standpoint, post-war British policy has been carried out by the supranational World Bank and its sister organization, the IMF. Headquartered in Washington to give the aura of power and authority to the United States, which is its largest bankroller, the Fund was established by John Maynard Keynes in 1944. Keynes, the key British delegate to the Bretton Woods conference, was deployed to relocate the empire's capabilities, particularly its loyal colonial civil servants. With Eugene Meyer, father of Brandt Commission member Katharine Graham, at its head, the World Bank's top staff read like a who's who of the colonial office, put in control of the credit lines for both the European reconstruction effort and the Third World. Decolonization took the colonial officers out of the colonies and put them into the economic headquarters of the World Bank. Shortly thereafter, the Commonwealth community was created. The Third World's top intellectuals and economists were molded by these supranational zero-growth institutions.

A typical example of this process was the 1954 sudden public limelight for Gunnar Myrdal in 1954, a Scandinavian social democrat with strong British inclinations. Myrdal launched a campaign to clear the crimes of the Empire by posing economic strategy in terms of a phony "North" versus "South" split between the "rich" and the "poor." His mammoth book *Asian Drama*, an analysis of that continent's poverty, was part of the revival of cultural relativism—the very notion the British East India Company had so effectively used to maintain its colonies in primitive conditions. Now cultural relativism was the major argument against the international growth policies being demanded by many Third World countries. An immediate brainwashing was needed, reasoned the British Foreign Office.

Out of the British Foreign Office setup appeared a key Hungarian emigré—Sir Thomas Balogh, the Fabian Society's "development" expert. The British Foreign

Office used Balogh to set up the Overseas Development Ministry (ODM) and Balogh brought in his circle of experts. They included Paul Streeten, later a founder of the "basic needs" strategy, which posits a redistributionist subsistence economy, rather than capital-intensive investment for growth; Dudley Seers, the first public proponent of "basic needs," warning the Third World against industrialization; and Barbara Castle, a Labour Party Member of Parliament who was made development minister in this new setup.

The trio began planning a "special institution" to carry out British policy, the Institute for Development Studies (IDS) at the University of Sussex. That university was chosen because, having been founded in the 1950s by the Secret Intelligence Service (SIS), it was capable of centralizing the most sophisticated psychological warfare operations necessary to brainwash planners into adopting the "basic needs" line. Sussex was already the base for the infamous "Columbus Trust," an offshoot of the Tavistock Institute for Human Relations, the British wartime brainwashing center.

A rapid institutionalization of British capabilities occurred. In 1967, the IDS began to develop its own satellite organizations, with Streeten moving to Oxford University where a program for training the diplomatic elite was set up. Queen Elizabeth House at Oxford was turned into the living quarters for Third World development officials in Britain for these intensive sessions with Streeten.

In 1968, Streeten took over the Institute for Commonwealth Studies at Oxford, transforming it from a token historical research operation into a sister development institute for IDS. The same year, IDS took control of Britain's leading economic development publication, *Journal for Development Studies*, by placing its people in more than half its editorial positions. By 1969, it built up its staff with the "best" from the Third World to back up its field studies for the "basic needs" outlook.

A final whitewash job was Streeten's takeover of the quarterly journal founded in 1931 as *Crown Colonies*. The prestigious pro-empire publication was renamed first *New Commonwealth* and then *World Development*; under the last name, it became the reading material for the newly independent-nation intelligentsia. The IDS, totally funded by Her Majesty, continued to make economic policy for the former colonies. Through this capability, Seers developed another umbrella organization, the Society for International Development (SID) in 1969, and at its inaugural meeting formally launched antitechnology, anti-Western ideas. Into the SID structure, Sussex brought the likes of Aspen Institute deindustrialization strategist, Harlan Cleveland, Belgian currency-warfare expert Robert Triffin, jesuitical ideologue Theodore Hesburgh, depopulation planner



Gunnar Myrdal

George Ball, and many other celebrities of the 1980s.

IDS-Sussex first extended its tentacles into the United Nations international agencies as supranational control bodies. At Geneva, the seat of continental European banking, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) was set up. In 1964, the International Labor Organization (ILO) was founded under Hans Singer, a German-born naturalized Briton. Singer was to be, with Streeten, Balogh, et al., a key IDS man in the U.N. structure. At IDS he had commissioned for the ILO the "empirical employment studies" for the basic-needs program. Seers was given one for Colombia; Richard Jolly, current IDS director, another for Sri Lanka; and Singer himself led the third for Kenya in 1972, where he also pioneered the setting up of the "Oxford South" institution in the capital, Nairobi.

Little wonder then that World Bank President Robert McNamara chose Nairobi in 1973 to launch that bank's formal labor-intensive programs. From 1969 on, McNamara developed a close working relationship with the Sussex group, and in 1974 he further revealed that IDS and the World Bank were working closely for the same goals.

Singer simultaneously drafted an ILO employment strategy, and in 1970 he published the *Sussex Manifesto*—the basis for the subsequent United Nations debate

on the New International Economic Order. Singer made the ILO one of the key institutions that would push the small-scale industries strategy and under him the ILO published its 1977 *Technologies for Basic Needs*, i.e., "appropriate technologies," written from start to finish by Singer himself.

II. Club of Rome/NATO

The next stage was to enforce the notion of underdevelopment through the military structure itself. Britain knew very well that to eliminate economic growth commitments in the Third World, it needed to control the developed sector's potential for embarking on a policy of transfer of technology. The NATO supranational command was utilized; in 1966-68, everything was prepared to create the Club of Rome. The Club of Rome was to be empowered with one task: that of disseminating the "postindustrial era" movements, first in the developed countries and then in the Third World as well.

The Club of Rome's principal founders and officers were all senior NATO functionaries. Take a sampling of its structure in 1970: Harlan Cleveland, former U.S. ambassador to NATO during the 1960s, and current U.S. chairman of the Atlantic Council, NATO's main arm in the United States, was a member of SID as well as the Club of Rome. George McGhee, former under-secretary of state for political military affairs, former ambassador to NATO, current director of Atlantic Council, was involved. Claiborne Pell, U.S. Senator from Rhode Island, former U.S. parliamentary representative to the Atlantic Council and advocate of NATO oversight of "an environmental world order" was there, as was Donald Lesh, until this summer director of the U.S. Association for the Club of Rome and a former National Security Council staffer for Henry Kissinger.

The self-declared founder of the Club of Rome idea Alexander King, is exemplary. King, current director for scientific affairs of the Organization for Economic Development and Cooperation and the International Federation of Institutes of Advanced Studies, works with NATO on economic planning. King, who claims to be the discoverer of Aurelio Peccei, made his view of NATO/Club of Rome relations explicit in a May 21 interview with *EIR*. "There will be all these troubles, invasions, migrations. Look at the number of foreigners already. The United Kingdom is no longer a white country. And even at the present rate, the white race is finished."

The Tavistock Institute provided NATO with psychological profiles necessary for an effective Club of Rome onslaught, including one key study attacking the U.S. space program and its assumption that broadscale, fast-paced technological innovation was desirable and necessary.



Shridith Ramphal

In 1968, before helping to found the Club of Rome, its chosen director Aurelio Peccei met with Tavistock Institute magazine editor Homer Perlmutter and NATO's top functionaries before opening this side of the operations.

The Club of Rome pulled in members from Mexico, Brazil, Poland, Sweden, Egypt, Nigeria, Ethiopia, France, and India. It was bankrolled in part by Willy Brandt, then chancellor of West Germany, who authorized funneling money through the Volkswagen Foundation. Its first report was a "world dynamic" model named *Limits to Growth*—the "systems analysis" justification for the earlier IDS work. Its authors, Jay Forrester and Dennis Meadows, produced it to demonstrate the "unsustainability" of complex, extended systems, and proposed smaller-scale structures for the world economy.

'Small is beautiful'

The Club of Rome's media blitz popularizing the "small is beautiful" ideology was nothing short of blackmail against generally ignorant populations. It threatened that nuclear power, large-scale industrialization, and technological progress were leading the world toward "holocaust" of resource extinction; in short, science was evil. As Peccei himself lied at the very time when nuclear power began to prove that abundant

energy for industrialization in the Third World was within reach, "There is little probability of energy becoming plentiful, inexpensive, and environmentally and socially unobjectionable."

For Peccei, massive depopulation seemed "socially unobjectionable" as a solution. Few of those who have accepted the "small is beautiful" ideology knew that its author, E. F. Schumacher, a German emigré to England, above all esteemed Burma, with its xenophobic, autarchic economy. Throughout the postwar period Burma has not been a nation-state, but a territory where the Chinese have run bloody wars between conflicting tribal armies over the drug and opium market. This was the model for "small is beautiful."

The 1972-76 period

As with the Brandt report today, the 1972-74 period was used to penetrate governments and attack national sovereignty from the inside. Queen Juliana of the Netherlands provided a forum for the Club of Rome in Rotterdam. Club of Rome members toured and lectured extensively. Two years later in 1974, ten selected heads of state were hosted by Austrian Chancellor Bruno Kreisky for a minisummit. Peccei lectured them on the evils of the nation-state concept and the need for "collective global responsibility"; Canada's Pierre Trudeau, among others, emerged as a solid convert. Peccei would later boast: "The seeds of doubt were cast."

The limits-to-growth propaganda was meant to produce a "shock effect," and it understandably produced a lively opposition. Next, the Club of Rome and the Institute for Development Studies at Sussex began an "in-house" opposition campaign to term the limits-to-growth view not "zero growth" but "managed growth" or "sustainable growth." Then came an application of the Forrester-Meadows work on *Mankind at a Turning Point*, beginning with an injunction: "The world has cancer and the cancer is Man."

The Club of Rome also penetrated several Third World countries. The planning ministries of Iran, Egypt, and Venezuela were the first to adopt its model as the basis for future economic planning.

In 1976, the Club of Rome scored an important success when Algeria, one of the radicals in the non-aligned movement, offered sponsorship for a conference on "Reshaping the International Order" (RIO). The Club of Rome wrote a book on this theme, in which redistribution of existing wealth becomes the Club of Rome's entry point into the North-South economic talks, while its attacks on advanced-sector "affluence" and "waste" were promoted by its agents in United Nations agencies.

Through RIO and complementary work done in the *Project on Futures* of the U.N. Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), various threads of the Club



Cultivating sorghum: the labor-intensive Commonwealth model.

of Rome's work come together. Erwin Laszlo, a Club of Rome member, produced at UNITAR a vitriolic attack on urban civilization and industrialization in 1977, and the UNITAR/Club of Rome study *Goals for Mankind* pulled in numerous Third World economists and intellectuals to produce background for this type of view.

RIO gave the Club of Rome/NATO apparatus the in-place capabilities to run destabilizations in many Third World countries through economic policy portfolios. And in 1977, NATO issued a study calling for the extension of its structure into the Third World. The call was made by Harlan Cleveland—Aurelio Peccei's longtime cothinker and coplanner.

The Brandt Commission

The Club of Rome's most conspicuous success has been the insinuation of its ideas of "triage" into international economic planning. Peccei's idea of "democratic triage" is very much an explicit part of the Brandt Commission's thesis. Peccei writes: "Damaged by the conflicting policies of the major countries and blocs,

roughly patched up here and there, the existing international economic order is visibly coming apart at the seams. . . . The prospect of the necessity of the recourse to *triage*—deciding who must be saved if all cannot be saved—is a very grim one indeed. But if, lamentably, events should come to such a pass, the right to make such decisions cannot be left to just a few nations, because it would lend them ominous power over the life of the world's hungry."

Early in 1977, when it became clear that the Paris-based North-South negotiations would fail, not least because of the blackmailing role of Henry Kissinger as U.S. Secretary of State, World Bank chief McNamara announced the formation of an "Independent Commission on North-South Issues," now named the Independent Commission on International Development Issues. He appointed Willy Brandt, no longer chancellor of West Germany but head of the Socialist International, as chairman of the commission. From its inception the Brandt Commission was meant to bring together the capabilities of the IDS/Commonwealth structure, already determining the World Bank's "basic needs"

approach, with those of the United Nations-based Club of Rome apparatus. To sell the commission, a "democratic" selection of representatives of both North and South was conducted by McNamara; without exception, friends and associates of Kissinger and McNamara were put on the commission. Kissinger himself was ever present in the back rooms.

The anglophile crowd was well represented in the selection of Ted Heath, Katharine Graham, and Peter Peterson from the "North," and Sir Shridath Ramphal from the "South." An effort was made to involve the Soviet Union as well, and China was kept well briefed by Heath, who visited Peking at crucial points in the deliberations.

From 1977 to 1979, the Brandt Commission still held eight closed meetings, the majority of which were held at Mont Pélérin, Switzerland, headquarters of the ultralibertarian Friedmanite Mont Pelerin Society. The Swiss government provided free offices and equipment for the secretariat in Geneva, close to the key offices of the U.N. agencies—UNCTAD, ILO, and UNIDO, and the commissioners were given other special help. At the first meeting at the Gymnich castle, special guests advising the commission were Harlan Cleveland, Kissinger, Guido Carli, and Canadian energy strategist Maurice Strong. Along with the World Bank's resident Marxist economist, Mahbub ul Haq, Kissinger, Cleveland, and Strong were in on all subsequent meetings where policy decisions were made.

As the two-year period progressed, the commissioners were deployed to particular parts of the world—to test the waters and modify their profiles and assessment. In October 1979, the commission decided to move its editing headquarters to Commonwealth Secretariat in London, and Ted Heath and Ramphal were placed in charge of producing the final document.

Of great value to the commission were the services of the Carter administration, which expressed total commitment and support to the proposals in progress. In fact, whether it was to a World Wildlife Fund meeting or to promote the Carter administration's own *Global 2000 Report* (itself a mirror of the Brandt proposals), members of the Carter administration would distribute the Brandt report with their blessing. Thus, when the report came out in 1980, tens of thousands were distributed free of charge in the Third World to mold public opinion.

It is important to note that the Brandt report received financial contributions from the apparatus which, under Brandt, had funded the Club of Rome—the German Marshall Fund, the Friedrich Ebert Foundation, the Friedrich Naumann Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and Scandinavian government resources. Several Third World countries also made financial contributions to the commission's work, but the most

important government backing was from the Canadian International Development Research Center under Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau.

Followup action

Four months before the commission made its recommendations public, the Society for International Development held a meeting in Sri Lanka to set up the framework for the organizing needed to sell it. Present at the Sri Lanka meeting were Peccei, U.N. Nonrenewable Energy conference chairman Enrique Iglesias, ODC chairman James Grant, IDS director Richard Jolly, and World Bank's old hand Paul Streeten. Jolly and Streeten recommended that, as in 1974, a select group of heads of state should be called together and brainwashed to accept the Brandt Commission ideas. Paul Streeten defined the objectives: "The need to build development efforts on indigenous values, combining modernity and tradition, and avoiding both a reaction to tribalism and an imposition of alien ideologies; the need is for new institutions both at the subnational and at the supranational level; the need is to adjust to inevitable changes rationally and with foresight."

The full circle of the IDS control of the Brandt Commission is evident at the July 10, 1980 meeting when its core policy-makers and planners are brought together at the institute for a seminar on "The Brandt Commission and Beyond." Here, the abovementioned figures and Belgian economist Robert Triffin examined the responses various countries had had to the report and worked out a series of experts' panels on such issues as food, energy, monetary, and financial policy to exercise their influence on government officials in various countries. The goal is a forthright top-down defense of World Bank/IMF structure.

As the Cancún, Mexico North-South summit approaches next month, IDS has fully deployed its capabilities to shape the outcome of that meeting. As in 1974, when Austrian Chancellor Bruno Kreisky played host to the Club of Rome machinations, Kreisky was originally instrumental in getting the Mexican government's sponsorship for the October summit.

Trudeau has also played a special role. Canada is a unique asset for the British Crown and the Club of Rome. As a member of the Commonwealth, it has access to the "South" group, while its large financial and raw-materials interests in the Caribbean area give it specific channels in the United States. Canadian officials are already boasting about their inside track with the Reagan administration. Canada has to set up two think tanks this year to deal exclusively with Canada-Third World relations; and one London-based Third World intellectual predicted that Canada could be in the unique situation of becoming the spokesman for both North and South. Lord Carrington certainly hopes so.