

EIR Special Report

The Non-Aligned's choice: debtors' cartel or IMF dictatorship

by Daniel Snieder, Asia Editor

When the leaders of the developing nations meet in the beginning of March in New Delhi for the seventh heads of state summit meeting of the Non-Aligned countries, they will face a world in grave crisis. The prospects for a recovery of the advanced industrial economies, now being held out to debt-strapped developing countries, will have proven a fraud and an illusion. The world will be in the midst of a financial collapse outstripping in scale the Great Depression of the 1930s. The resolution of the crisis can only go in one of two directions—towards a fascist austerity-based world order ruled by a supranational financial dictatorship or the creation of a new world economic order.

The Non-Aligned countries, who throughout their history as a movement have acted as the leadership of the developing sector, will face a choice.

The choice is ultimately not economic in the narrow sense but political. It is now a matter of public discussion that the Non-Aligned have one weapon in their hands to usher in a new order: the creation of a debtors' cartel. *EIR* founder Lyndon LaRouche, the intellectual author of the "debt bomb" proposal, has summarized this state of affairs in a recent *EIR* memo to the Non-Aligned countries:

"To such circles [the financial powers] the practical question of 1983 is not how to prevent the financial collapse, but how to manage the collapse, how to prearrange who shall and shall not survive the \$1 to \$2 trillions financial collapse they deem inevitable for 1983. . . .

"It is the declared intention of some among these plotters, including Fritz Leutwiler of the Basel, Switzerland Bank for International Settlements, to 'kill the developing nations' by protracted financial starvation over the course of an indefinite period beginning the early months of 1983. Others emphasize a process of grabbing selected natural-resources assets of developing nations. 'Gunboat' debt-collection (NATO 'out-of-area deployments') and means modeled on the British takeover of Egypt during the 19th century are among the designs featured in statements from these quarters. . . .

"The general plan is to intimidate President Ronald Reagan into capitulating to a specific kind of purported 'banking-system bail-out plan' by approximately Jan. 28, 1983, and, with the President's assistance, to terrify the U.S. Congress into submission by the second half of February. . . .



"NO PREVIOUS THEORY SEEMS CAPABLE OF EXPLAINING THE CURRENT CRISIS IN WORLD ECONOMY..."



"ECONOMIC RECOVERY THROUGH AUSTERITY ALMOST SURELY WILL TAKE LONGER THAN THE CITIZENS OF MOST ADVANCED DEMOCRACIES WILL TOLERATE..."



"...THE DEBTORS SHOULD BE DEPRIVED—TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE—OF THE WEAPON OF DEFAULT..."



"...IN THE END, THE ISSUE IS PSYCHOLOGICAL..."

SLOAN

Christopher Sloan/New Solidarity

"Once the U.S.A. has agreed to take the principal brunt of the financial collapse, the collapse will be triggered, most probably during March 1983. This crash will create escalating panic throughout the period leading into the May 1983 Williamsburg conference. That state of panic is intended to bring the governments participating into a state of submissiveness. The plotters will then demand that the International Monetary Fund be elevated to become a 'world central bank.'

"Over the recent years, especially the year leading into the August 1976 Non-Aligned conference at Colombo, Sri Lanka, leading forces within the Non-Aligned nations group . . . have proposed policies of international debt reorganization which might have prevented the recent and present monetary crisis, and which continue to be sound on principle for the situation today. . . .

"To secure that kind of monetary reform which is immediately in the urgent interest of both OECD and developing nations, it is necessary to break the political power of that financial cabal, to greatly weaken the grip of that cabal over the policies of governments.

"There is probably only one means by which this might be accomplished: a debtor-nations' cartel, whose negotiating demands are in the urgent common interest of OECD and developing nations. Although such action would be met initially with a ferocious escalation of the hostile actions the idea of such a cartel has met repeatedly since 1975, once it became clear that those escalated threats and related menacing actions would not suffice to break up the cartel, a number of governments, would abruptly shift their policy postures to one of negotiating cooperative actions with the cartel."

Henry Kissinger, the hit man for the financial dictators, has published a response to this policy in the Jan. 24 issue of *Newsweek* magazine. Announcing that any idea of "uninterrupted progress" is an "illusion," the man who was responsible for destabilizing the governments and murdering the leaders of the nations who fought for debt restructuring in 1976 says quite directly:

"The debtors should be deprived—to the extent possible—of the weapon of default. The industrial democracies urgently require a safety net [for] the threatened financial institutions. This would reduce both the sense of panic and the debtors' capacity for blackmail."

For Kissinger and his employers the problem is not a financial one—it is political, or, as he says, "in the end the issue is psychological." Kissinger wants the developing countries to submit to the IMF. "Unfortunately," Kissinger intones, "political leaders march to a different drummer than financial experts." Indeed. "If pushed into a corner, a political leader may well seek to rally populist resentment against foreign 'exploiters.' "

Kissinger's solution is clear—do anything and everything to make sure such political leaders, the leaders who will gather in New Delhi in March, do not "rally." The options for the leaders gathered there is equally clear—submit, and watch their nations die, or fight with the one weapon the enemy fears most, in order to survive and progress.

A 'New Bretton Woods' is not in the interests of the Non-Aligned

by Renée Sigerson

For the nations of the Non-Aligned movement to avoid a severely worsened economic collapse in the near-term, there must be established a new international monetary system. The new arrangements which need to be brought into practice by responsible governments, however, must in no way be confused with the specifically evil recommendations for world monetary reorganization now being circulated by several international organizations under the heading of a "New Bretton Woods."

Human civilization has no time for compromises to be made on this issue. In a "Kissingerian" step-by-step fashion, a number of features of the "New Bretton Woods" blueprint have already been put into effect as governing policy for international banks and financial agencies such as the International Monetary Fund. Since the third quarter of 1982, international commercial-bank lending to developing countries has been slashed to 50 percent of 1981 levels. This is only the opening shot of the "New Bretton Woods" blueprint.

The effort to launch a New Bretton Woods has unfolded gradually, like a theater script, since the September, 1981 annual conference of the International Monetary Fund (IMF). The forces behind this proposal are the Western world's two chief financial centers, London and Switzerland. In the midst of the greatest financial crisis in world history since the 14th century, the London-Swiss axis is aiming to use the crisis to terrify governments into accepting a world financial dictatorship, the actual content of what is called the New Bretton Woods program.

The blueprint being proposed is to a large extent a revival of the original 1944 Bretton Woods proposal of Lord Maynard Keynes, who urged that the postwar monetary order be put under the cartelized control of a single, World Central Bank. In 1944, Keynes's design was shot down by a U.S. President and Congress who refused to finance such a dictatorship. The postwar monetary system resolved upon was thus a compromise between the Keynesians and other international forces.

The first indications of a serious revival of the Keynes approach became public in 1980. At that time, leading British and Swiss financial policymakers reached agreement on a strategic assessment of the effects on the world economy of the usurious interest rate policies which had been implemented by the United States in 1979. Concluding that a

worsened economic depression in the traditionally industrialized countries was well under way, these financial power centers realized that the depression would probably trigger "undesirable" political reactions. The London and Switzerland axis concluded that efforts had to be gotten under way immediately to "channel" and subvert the political tendencies which could arise in defiance of the effects of spreading depression.

Of great concern to these layers was to prevent any revival of support in the developing sector for the pro-growth and debt moratorium programs which had gained majority Third World support at the 1976 Colombo, Sri Lanka Non-Aligned summit.

London and the BIS boys

In 1980, a series of meetings took place at the headquarters of the Bank for International Settlements in Basel, Switzerland, whose contents were then reflected in major financial press. Under discussion was the idea that the BIS had to assume an expanded role in overseeing the world financial system. The viewpoint expressed at that time was that the International Monetary Fund was not sufficiently "objective," in implementing world financial policy, because its bureaucracy was too beholden to governments.

Ultimately, the IMF and BIS are controlled by the same people. However, the IMF is dependent for its financing on governments and elected parliaments. The BIS, in contrast, is a *private* organization.

The BIS was formed, and is run, by a few dozen private financial fortunes, the majority of whose family names can be obtained simply by listing the boards of directors of Europe's two largest private insurance companies, Riunione Assicurazioni di Sicutrta of Trieste, and Assicurazioni Generali of Genoa. In this constellation of private European family fortunes, Great Britain represents a key political resource, because of the colonial empire base of power over centuries of British finance.

The unfolding of the gameplan

The first unveiling of the New Bretton Woods scheme occurred in 1981, at the Washington, D.C. IMF annual meeting. During the proceedings, outgoing BIS director Jelle Zijlstra delivered a "farewell" address to the international

banking community in which he mourned the effects high interest rates were having on the world economy. Zjilstra declared that a return to fixed exchange rates, based on central-bank control of a fixed world gold supply, was a necessary monetary cleansing measure that had to be undertaken to gain control over the snowballing world depression.

Several months later, the BIS ran a "test-run" in Washington, D.C., circulating Zjilstra's proposal among leading conservatives around the U.S. Congress. The conduit through which this test-run was conducted was the research section and board of directors of Morgan Guaranty Trust Company. In London, Morgan's affiliate, Morgan Grenfell—a bank which maintains extremely close connections to the British Foreign Office—rallied support for the Zjilstra proposal in slightly altered form.

Following this initial foray, behind the scenes, BIS functionaries, with the continuing backup of the Morgan interests, continued to test out international financial institutions on reactions to increasing the global credit-control policies of the BIS. To get the most intimate sense of what the private financial interests behind the BIS viewed as their objective, it is useful to remember that the BIS was formed in 1931 to manage a creditor's cartel following Germany's debt moratorium. It was through channels controlled by the BIS that the reorganization of Germany's finances in 1931 became the occasion for a decade of global economic depression.

In May 1982, the fruits of the BIS's activities were realized at a private meeting at the Ditchley Park estate in London of international commercial bankers. Brought together for the purpose of forming a creditors' cartel, the banker resolved to coordinate all lending to the Third World. The 26 largest Western commercial banks were represented. New York's Chase Manhattan bank volunteered to handle public relations activity for the "Ditchley bankers" group, but, investigations revealed, the Morgan interests were the real brains running the Ditchley show.

With the formation of the Ditchley Group of bankers, the first phase in organizing for a New Bretton Woods was brought to completion. Following that May 1982 meeting, international lending by commercial banks to developing countries was slashed by 50 percent. Although the legality of the Ditchley Group is presently being heavily contested in the United States on anti-trust grounds, for all intents and purposes, international private lending, through that organization is now entirely under the control of the BIS. The advanced-sector banks for now are playing by the rules of the "New Bretton Woods."

Harold Lever and the Brandt Commission

As the BIS leads Western bankers down the insane path of maintaining depression through lending cutoffs, manipulation of the Third World's interests in the global debt fight has fallen to the lot of the revamped, modern-day outposts of the old British colonial office. Exemplary of institutions which "represent" Third World interests from a colonialist standpoint is the so-called Brandt Commission. Also important is

the Swiss/Venetian controlled Geneva headquarters of UNCTAD, and such British Fabian organizing instruments as the Society for International Development.

In early 1982, the Queen of England's servant, former cabinet member Sir Harold Lever, elaborated at the Churchill Memorial Lectures the basic institutional change required by London and Switzerland to maintain control over world finance. Lever called for the creation of a new "world central bank." Lever made several subsequent private speeches in behalf of the design. December 1982 British press coverage of Lever's concept specified how the new Bank would function as a "sort of central bank of central banks [which] would act as a lender of last resort in appropriate cases and . . . exercise the kind of general supervision over international lending that is now exercised by central banks over domestic banks." In short: an instrument of world financial dictatorship which has the power to bail out banks at the expense of the credit needs of international trade and borrowing countries.

In July 1982, Brandt Commission founding member Robert McNamara—an avowed enemy of the developing sector—delivered a speech at an international conference of the Society for International Development, held in Baltimore, Maryland. The former World Bank president and depopulation advocate urged that a new world central bank be created as part of founding a "New Bretton Woods."

In statements widely played up in international media, calls for various features of the New Bretton Woods have been issued by U.S. Treasury Secretary Donald Regan; Felix Rohatyn of Lazard Frères; former U.S. Treasury Secretary Henry Fowler; and dozens of others. The proposal forms the core of a special report to be issued by the Brandt Commission in February, whose contents were worked out at a December 1982 Brandt Commission meeting in Ottawa. The Brandt Commission version of the proposal is aimed to be the dominating document at the June 1983 Belgrade UNCTAD conference. It is also being timed to disrupt proceedings at the end-of-March preparatory meeting of the Group of 77 to be held in Argentina.

According to the Brandt Commission's London office, the chief points of the document are as follows:

- An emergency meeting of IMF governors should be held to discuss means for increasing global liquidity.
- The IMF should be given powers to increase printing of Special Drawing Rights.
- The IMF should be given free reign to borrow funds on the private markets.
- The IMF's quotas should be doubled.
- The World Bank should be permitted to use a larger portion of its funds to bolster IMF "adjustment" programs.

Manipulation of the U.S. Congress

There is a substantial amount of political resistance in U.S. political circles against providing U.S. financing for this program. The BIS and Morgan interests, in recent weeks, have launched an extensive propaganda campaign to break up this resistance, and get the U.S. to print funds, no ques-

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-

tion], UNIDO [United Nations Industrial Development Organization]. . . . We were making sure that there would be no overlap, that we would all focus our efforts.

It is an absolutely crucial, absolutely important effort to control population. . . . End of January, we're having a meeting with International Planned Parenthood Federation in London, with IUCN and WWF—we'll discuss on how conservation can be brought into the 1984 World Population Conference, which will meet for the tenth anniversary of the Bucharest conference of 1974. We're sending Peter Sand and Mike Cockerell. . . .

Prince Philip is brilliant. He's incredibly active. He chairs all the executive committee meetings. He's involved right down with every aspect of policy.

Global 2000 is a remarkable document. It does good things. It draws a very dramatic view of the situation—the same thing that the Club of Rome study *Limits to Growth* did. The figures may not be accurate, but people who complain about that miss the point.

Michael Cockerell, a WWF diplomat

From an interview with Michael Cockerell, of the World Wildlife Fund-International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) and the Conservation for Development Center:

The January meeting at the IPPF [International Planned Parenthood Federation] in London will be a large one: it is going to be a forum to prepare the [1984] World Population Conference. You see, it is pointless to simply concentrate on conservation alone. . . . The root cause is population in the first place. . . .

Take for example the national conservation strategy in Nepal: We [IPPF] have the business of population built into that whole structure. The magnitude of the problem there is terrifying. The mountains of the Himalayas for millions of years have been falling into the ocean, and mankind has helped a great deal since it has been around. The population problem has pushed that beyond all bounds.

Inevitably, for the Third World, you must think in terms of appropriate technologies. In much of the developing world, nuclear energy is not appropriate. . . .

We face the problem [of triage] every day. To ensure the best return on investment for our assistance, we have to decide: are there countries that have gone too far to be helped?

At IUCN we discussed it last week: typically, a country will concentrate aid or resources it gets on industrialization in its richer areas. We concentrate on the marginal areas.

Population conditionality is a very tricky one for any type of outside imposition. . . . I was in Rwanda recently; you know how much of an overpopulation problem they have. You cannot even mention population control. The question

is almost taboo! "It's the will of God, the country is infinite, resources are infinite." It's a question of education—so that they will accept it from the inside. For this reason they need education—that's our most important contribution. We don't educate children only. We have a whole program: how to get a message gradually accepted; identify the influentials in a village, figure out how certain concepts can be put over, and so on. They must experience things for themselves.

Eleonora Masini of the Club of Rome's Forum Humanum

Excerpts follow from an interview with Eleonora Masini, Club of Rome member and reported to be the controller of Club of Rome President Aurelio Peccei. Masini is a professor at the Gregorian University in Rome and created the Club of Rome's Forum Humanum organization.

We are living in a moment of crisis which is not only economic. It is the crisis of a way of life and of a conception of development. It was assumed that [development] could go on and be projected in the future the way it went in the 1960s. The future would be better. The 1970s have shown us that it is not possible in physical terms. . . . It is a double process; in developed countries, people realize that the economic-based model of development based on science and technology is not meeting their needs. The second trend is in developing countries; they are not accepting the transfer of the Western, industrial conception of life. The pressure of the world economic and financial crisis brings to the fore the need for the other aspects to dominate. . . .

The time is finished of the economic growth that was centralized, measured in GNP, with science and technology saving us all, or the idea that transfers of technology would save the North-South debate. Whatever transfer—of capital, of technology, of "know-how" (I don't like that word)—it does not help answer the basic needs. . . .

The logic which caused the [population] problem—science, technology—cannot be used to solve it! Africa must meet its basic needs within its own culture.

That puts a lot of things, of institutions, in question. Like the family. . . . Unfortunately, the notion of the nation-state seems to be very important for developing countries. . . .

I am working at present on the theme of the family in developing countries. It's a U.N. university project, called "Household, Gender, and Age". . . .

Psychosociological movements, threads that cut across cultures, [are] reactions to or guidelines from history, to the woman's image in history. . . . an image concealed and overpowered by layer upon layer of industrial societies. We must unearth, *unearth* it. . . . This is the resurrection of Isis, of Cybele, one could say, Magna Mater brought to light. . . . This is very important in Latin America. I am doing field work there. . . .