

International Credit by Renée Sigerson

Haig backs off on 'bilateralism' scheme

A great gameplan to replace the IMF/World Bank with more efficient instruments of genocide has been scotched.

At hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 25, Secretary of State Alexander Haig's gameplan for subjugating all U.S. "development assistance" under a bureaucratic arrangement, codenamed "bilateralism," was hastily dumped like a hot potato.

Under recommendation from committee chairman Charles Percy, the Senate body voted unanimously to authorize all funding recommended by the Carter administration for the International Development Agency (IDA), the low interest window of the World Bank, and the African Development Bank, both multilateral institutions challenged by Haig.

The chucking of "bilateralism" is the outcome of a growing rebellion against Haig on Capitol Hill for his advocacy of Global 2000, the policy recommendation authored by the Carter State Department Office of Population Affairs which proposes deliberate genocide as the only viable foreign policy objective for the U.S. in its relations with the Third World.

During the hearings, Haig State Department underling Ernie Johnson made the 180 degree turn on "bilateralism" official, saying that multilateral institutions "do a lot we don't give them credit for."

Most Americans only got a brief glimpse of the fight over development assistance agencies which has been occurring in Washington, when Budget Director David

Stockman challenged foreign aid on the grounds of imperative fiscal cutbacks.

Stockman's attacks on foreign assistance as an abuse of taxpayers' monies was a deliberate hoax aimed at facilitating Haig's "bilateralism" design.

The real issue being fought out in Washington in recent weeks was never "how much" to spend on foreign aid, but how to control what was spent. The importance attributed to this question by Haig's circle is demonstrated by the fact that two top-level policy reviews on "bureaucratic" oversight of foreign assistance are currently under way: one is an Interagency Task Force publicly announced at testimony earlier this month by Treasury official Tim McNamar; the other is a top-secret review being handled by the National Security Council. The concept of "bilateralism" was developed for Haig by the Washington, D.C.-based Heritage Foundation think tank.

Heritage and Haig's clique have put the multinational lending institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) under fire, because these institutions remain subject to political, nationalistic influences from all over the world, which nobody quite controls. Although the IMF et al. have administered in recent decades programs of brutal austerity that have indeed laid the foundation for Global 2000's program of genocide, Haig and Company view the IMF as

"outdated" and inefficient in executing the task of population elimination.

Based on the old colonial experiences of Britain, and to a lesser extent, France, the World Bank, for example, has been known to finance straightforward economic development projects—such as hydroelectric dam construction—as the "price" for sustaining political networks in the Third World nations it strives to control.

The first signal that Haig was preparing a retreat on "bilateralism" came in testimony by Haig crony James Buckley, undersecretary for security affairs, before the Senate. In a reversal of Haig's assault on funding the "multibanks," Buckley reported, "The cardinal principle of our foreign policy is that we will meet all of our commitments overseas."

By the time of the Senate hearings on the IDA authorization, Haig had made his retreat complete. A State Department specialist in "multibanks" at the Economics and Business Affairs bureau explained the rejection of "bilateralism" as follows: "There are a lot of postcolonial governments which are very suspicious and hostile to multinational corporations" and industrial government bureaucracies. "The multilateral banks can act for us in situations where we cannot act directly. There's a lot of interaction of officials there—actors who are not under anyone's thumb who have formed their own international development community."

This description of the IMF and its like is the traditional British colonial justification for global bureaucracies, the "structure" Haig's bilateralism aimed to replace.