

tions asked, for this program to revamp the IMF.

In a series of high-profile press articles and Congressional testimonies, leading scions of the private financial community have been warning that a debtors' cartel in the Third World may blow up the U.S. banking system at any moment. A climate of outright panic is being deliberately generated to convince U.S. politicians that no alternative to transforming the IMF into a world central bank exists.

On Jan. 10, former U.S. Treasury Secretary Henry Fowler urged in testimony before Congress that the United States support a charter revision of the IMF to allow it to expand its power. "The IMF is evolving into a different kind of function than established at Bretton Woods," Fowler told a Congressional committee. "Since then, a huge international market, the Eurodollar market, has grown up outside the scope of central bank supervision, and its supervision is not provided for in the IMF charter." As a result of Fowler's testimony and other, related pressures, two cabinet-level meetings during January were devoted to examining proposals for revising the charter of the IMF and expanding its powers.

Two kinds of debt moratoria

Additionally, "influentials" typified by Wall Street's Felix Rohatyn have floated a related proposal, suggesting that up to 50 percent of all current Third World debt be juridically written off, and put on a long-term basis. Around the Brandt Commission, interviews with their experts reveal, there is a similar consensus that the first task of a revamped IMF or new world central bank would be to systematize guaranteed interest payments on approximately \$350 billion worth of debt, after this debt had been rescheduled on a 10 to 20 year basis.

The lip-service given by these anti-growth forces to the necessity for some kind of debt moratorium raises the most important question the Non-Aligned summit must not waver on: What is the difference between the financial "moratorium" process the BIS and IMF are pushing, and the type of moratorium associated with international economist Lyndon LaRouche and the 1976 Colombo Non-Aligned resolutions?

The kind of debt moratorium the proponents of a New Bretton Woods are holding out to the Third World is a financial reorganization which would only occur *after* a top-down financial dictatorship has been consolidated under BIS control. Such a "moratorium" would not pave the way for needed, substantial volumes of new lending, but would be used by London and Switzerland as the juridical basis for extracting interest payments from export earnings and virtual elimination of any government expenditures towards internal development. In writing off some large portion of old debt, the new world central bank would tighten its political control over all financial institutions able until now to generate credit. "Let's make a clean sweep of things," is part of the attitude behind this type of "moratorium," but only under terms which maintain London, Switzerland and the old private fortunes of Europe as the center of political control over world finance.

Under such conditions, the world banking system would be smaller, as would the world economy, and the nations of the developing sector would be reduced to bestial servility under British-Swiss control.

Göran Ohlin, Brandt Commission Secretary

The following interviews were conducted in January by European Economics Editor Laurent Murawiec in order to document the attitude of the Brandt Commission and World Wildlife Fund toward the developing sector. From an interview with Göran Ohlin, Secretary of the Brandt Commission (the Independent Commission on International Development Issues), and professor at the University of Uppsala, Sweden:

The Mexican crisis . . . has been immensely pedagogical. . . . There is and there is going to be a drastic cutback of new lending, a colossal reduction in the importing capacity of developing countries. It has already been reduced by \$100 billion in the last two years, we calculated. . . .

We will attempt, in the new document that will be published in February [from the December Ottawa meeting of the Brandt Commission] to focus on the immediate financial problems of the creeping debt crisis. . . . [These proposals include an emergency meeting of the governors of the IMF to decide on means of increasing global liquidity; a major creation of SDRs and their allocation; a decision that the IMF will borrow directly on the market; a doubling of IMF quotas; and authorization of the World Bank to lift from 10 percent up to 30 percent the ratio of its loans that can go to "structural adjustment."—L.M.]

We are not proposing a world debt conference. Situations are specific. Attempts to discuss general principles for debt forgiveness are doomed. And, don't exaggerate the debt problem. There is a lot of disaster pornography going on these days. . . . Joint debt negotiation is relevant. . . . But look, the Club of Paris [creditors' committee] is overworked, but we have a good record at debt renegotiation, both private and official. No one wants to replace the case-by-case approach by sweeping, across-the-board measures. . . .

Don't worry about the repayment of debt. Nobody wants the debts to be repaid—that would be the end of the trade of the Northern nations. But what is needed is that debt payments be recovered, that interest be honored, the debt rolled over in an orderly manner. The task is not insuperable.

A debtors' cartel? Given its nature, the Brandt Commission could not support such a confrontationist idea. We are very anxious to keep the conflicts as low as possible. The Latin Americans are puffing themselves before negotiations; I doubt they are serious. In any case, the IMF is aware of this. Often the Fund is dismissed as though it was staffed by imbeciles or Leutwilers. No, no.

The Commission has a lot of sympathy for the idea of an international monetary conference. But I would insist on a tremendous difference: in 1944 [the year of the Bretton Woods conference], markets were closed, it was a start from scratch. But we won't have a super-crash now. . . . One has to explore carefully the idea a big crash would clear the deck—but it would hardly be wise to perform the experiment. We'll have a lot of smaller reforms. [Ohlin advocated a major effort for raw-material stabilization. His concern with UNCTAD's Common Fund approach was that there "is no world government to run it."—L.M.]

One thing could be misleading, that is, to blame "the system" for weaknesses that have to do with the tremendous inward pull of national governments which makes them so reluctant to submit to international discipline. . . . We don't need the crash, but it heightens the comprehension of the issues involved.

Peter Scott, World Wildlife Fund Vice-President

From an interview with Sir Peter Scott, Vice-President, World Wildlife Fund (WWF) International, and head of the World Wildlife Fund, United Kingdom:

If we look at things causally, the biggest problem in the world is population. There are too many people for too few resources. . . .

I would start with this: all development aid should be made dependent on the existence of strong family planning operations in the countries concerned. If they have family planning, we send wheat, food, money. . . .

All the big international population organizations have existed for umpteen years, but they have only barely scratched the surface. We must set population ceilings.

The present financial crisis is a great opportunity. . . . I am not a financial expert, of course, I cannot go into details. I have great admiration for [former Secretary of Defense] Robert McNamara. Of course he could not achieve all he had set out to achieve, especially in the population sphere—there was too much inertia, he was up against too much resistance.

My biggest concern—I am a wild life chap, a naturalist, a biologist. . . . Well, we are destroying the tropical rain forest. That's the most dreadful thing. . . . We should come to growing firewood per se: we should have huge plantations of firewood near the population centers.

A bright spot is that nuclear energy is losing out in the developing countries, even though there are enough countries involved with it. It can be potentially disastrous. These fast-breeder people in France, they're making plutonium all the time. . . .

What is great about Prince Philip [Chairman of the WWF International] is that he can talk to the leading people, to the

rulers of any country, man to man, and they listen. . . . I have known him for a long time—he was the president of my own Waterfowl Association, now the Wildfowl Trust—Prince Charles is now its president, and we have a Wildfowl Trust of North America, too.

When we started the WWF, one of the first people I visited was Prince Philip. . . . We did not want to have a British president at that time, . . . so we had Prince Bernhard. But since [Philip] became president, he has made it a much sharper-edged organization.

At the Commonwealth Secretariat, we do find some echo; Sonny Ramphal [Sridath Ramphal of Guyana, Secretary-General of the British Commonwealth] is very good, very good. I have spent a lot of time trying to convince him to get Commonwealth policies working along these lines. He's very well aware of things. He's good news. He's doing a very good job.

Charles de Haes, WWF Director-General

From an interview with Charles de Haes, Director-General, World Wildlife Fund (WWF):

In the short run, the world economic and financial crisis is not making our job easy because the first thing countries cut in the budgets is conservation. . . . But more conservation, not less, is needed. . . .

Eco-catastrophies will awaken awareness. . . . But until now, governments lack the political will. . . .

If there is depression, if it goes to a financial collapse, developing countries will suffer most. We have some fat we can live off, we can retrench, consume less. But in the developing world, poverty is the biggest threat to conservation. . . . We are working to make sure that the aid agencies directing aid to the real priorities, in which conservation is included from the beginning.

IUCN [International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources] alone, WWF alone, UNDP [United Nations Development Program] alone had not one chance of success. Together, it was another matter, since all three had a common strategy.

We now have a special project for followup on the world conservation strategy, within IUCN: the Conservation for Development Center, headed by Michael Cockerell. He's building up a team here, since many resources are available in aid agencies; it will help developing countries to establish their own national conservation strategies. . . .

We've just had a meeting where we had invited all the U.N. agencies. There was Mustafa Tolba, the head of UNDP, Dr. Lee Talbot of IUCN, and I. We had the FAO [Food and Agriculture Organization], UNESCO, UNDP, WHO [World Health Organization], ILO [International Labor Organiza-