Deputy Assistant Secretary Lisle Widman, met in London and resolved on the need for an international summit to lay out the transition to "SDR substitution" for the dollar. Then, Luxembourg Central Bank President Jaans and other European central bank chiefs flew hurriedly into Washington for a secret meeting April 26 at Stephen Axelrod's Fed office to discuss the SDR in the context of the "total and rapid restructuring of the Eurodollar market," Luxembourg banking sources told EIR Wiesbaden.

New York Fed President Paul Volker, the leading U.S. protégé of Fred Hirsch, detailed how the ECU will be made to serve as Triffin's Europa at the April 21 Columbia University International Monetary Conference, sponsored by the Anglophile Dillon Read investment bank. "What would be the effect on the dollar," he asked, "if the ECU were made into a really attractive financial asset?" Conference participant H. Gutovski, president of the Hamburg Weltwirtschaft Institute, reporting on this, told EIR Wiesbaden that Volker had in mind exactly Triffin's proposals for the ECU. Volker acclaimed the "piecemeal elevation of the SDR as a reserve asset" and predicted that by year's end, the IMF substitution account would go into effect. U.S. Treasury Undersecretary Robert Solomon and Assistant Secretary Fred Bergsten agreed with Volker there.

This intensity of Anglophilism from the U.S. Central Bank and Treasury itself has been enough to allow the British tendencies of West German central bank chief Otmar Emminger and his deputy, Karl Otto Poehl, to prevail over Chancellor Helmut Schmidt's desire to use the EMS rather to save the dollar. As our International Credit Market Column details, "The West Germans will never go against the IMF," a source close to Poehl told EIR April 25, "because the U.S. has made German adherence to the IMF a direct issue of the strategic alliance with the U.S. itself. The SDR is therefore ... a process ... somewhat down the road, but the ECU is a different story, more immediate, in the Bundesbank's viewpont. The SDR will be brought in on the back of the ECU."

The Bundesbank's latest monthly report, accordingly, claims that the current state of world banking through the dollar constitutes "over-recycling" through commercial banks, and should be shifted instead through the IMF directly. The source close to Mr. Poehl commented on this that "Although up to now the Bundesbank has made no comment on the substitution account, all they are waiting to see is whether the U.S. is really ready to support the SDR."

—Kathy Burdman

ABA talks about U.S. credit plans

Executive Intelligence Review conducted the following interview with a spokesman for the American Bankers Association in Washington, D.C. on Sen. Jesse Helms' efforts to repeal the Credit Control Act of 1969.

EIR: Why did Senator Helms introduce a bill to repeal the Credit Control Act? It's been around since 1969.

ABA: There has been some talk in the Administration about targeting particular areas of credit for control. No one has talked about across the board controls, however.

EIR: What provoked the 1969 bill in the first place? As I understand it, the Administration had not even asked for it.

ABA: Well, there had been a credit control act which was used during World War II and the Korean War, but it had expired. The 1969 act was a resurrection of that. It was drafted at a time when there was consideration of using credit controls to prevent further conglomerate mergers. You remember, that was a time of major conglomerate activity, and the

idea was that huge amounts of credit were being expended for these takeovers which were not productive in that they were not increasing the GNP.

EIR: Is that what the current Administration is interested in?

ABA: I have heard talk on two points. First, to control credit for these four and five year new car loans, which is a relatively new phenomenon. And second, to control credit for the financing of hostile takeover bids. But the previous idea is probably kicking around, too. The point is to ascertain when credit is being used unproductively.

EIR: What is the Fed's position?

ABA: The Fed, and Miller, have said that they do not support the implementation of the Act. However, I don't know if they would go so far as to support its repeal. The Administration has not made its position known.

EIR: And the ABA?

ABA: We will be meeting this week on whether to testify at the Helms hearings and what our position will be.