

candidate of Washington, London, Peking, Tel Aviv and Tripoli, in what are euphemistically called Uganda's upcoming elections.

The deployments of the hordes assembled in such a way by the Brzezinski-affiliated Rescue Committee are the corollary of Secretary of State Muskie's insistence that the world population be reduced.

The continent of Africa is not dying. It is being deliberately murdered.

It is at this point that we may reintroduce Jacob Javits and Felix Rohatyn. These New York figures are not merely members of the Executive Board of the International Rescue Committee. They are also, since 1973, among the most outspoken advocates within the United States of global policies of energy austerity and labor-intensive economics, policies developed primarily in London and New York and forced on countries of the Third World, including most emphatically the continent of Africa, in the name of solving the world economic crisis.

As the drafters of those policies knew back in the early 1970s, a few short years of intensification of such measures would ensure genocide on a scale unparalleled in human history. Africa has been systematically starved of credit, capital goods, manpower training, and development. Africa has been allowed, at most, "appropriate technology."

In the process, across vast areas of the world's largest and potentially richest continents, organized social and political life has been driven backwards into conditions of barbarism and chaos. The basis for human existence itself has been destroyed as human labor power has been eroded through continuing drought, famine, and war, and as land itself has been transformed into desert and semi-arid scrub incapable, with existing technologies on the continent, of sustaining the activities of any kind of agriculture, or any kind of life except that of the marauding bands of Uganda, Chad, and Zaire.

Africa is not alone in this. But in Africa alone, barring the outbreak of thermonuclear war, we stand before a situation in which the continent as a whole is on the verge of the holocaust. Africa will be the first victim of the standing policies of the circles behind the World Bank and its allies to die, if measures are not taken to reverse the situation.

Such are the realities behind Muskie's sanctimonious claims that the United States has done more for the continent of Africa than anyone else. Much more has to be changed than simply reversing present aid programs by supplying American agricultural surpluses to the continent. We must break the constraints imposed on both advanced and so-called developing sectors to create the basis for real development. Or Africa will not be butchered alone.

Africa's peril: scope and solutions

by Mary Brannan

Four hundred to 500 people are dying every day in the Karamoja district of northern Uganda. In East Africa, out of a total population of about 95 million, 10 million people are immediately threatened with starvation. Five million of these are in Ethiopia, totaling one-sixth of the Ethiopian population. Twenty African countries are on the emergency list of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization. Throughout Africa, more than 60 million are affected by drought; several million have now become refugees. Locusts are at work in Nigeria and Cameroon, and are breeding unchecked in Chad.

Let there be no mistake about the real causes, and thus the responsibilities, for the destruction of the people and the territory of Africa. The development of science and technology means that today war, famine and pestilence are no longer acts of God or nature, no longer Malthusian constraints. They can only be the results of deliberate policies.

The causes of the economic crises in Africa have been obscured by a series of myths.

Myth I. The drought is a natural disaster. In the developed nations, yearly weather fluctuations—even a succession of dry periods—may give rise to difficulties, but do not lead to mass starvation. Why? Because the economy can sustain and expand production of an overall surplus based on the development and implementation of new technologies. This has enabled the industrialized countries, above all the United States, to reduce their agricultural workforce from between 60 and 80 percent of all laborers more than a century ago to between 4 and 10 percent today. Rapid and efficient transportation, processing, and storage enables food to be stockpiled and rapidly moved as needed. The quality and quantity of nutrition has increased to supply growing populations.

Water can be piped from long distances or desalinated, fertilizers and trace elements supplied, new seed and animal varieties bred, pesticides and herbicides developed. Greenhouses and hydroponics can provide 24-hour, 365-day growing opportunities; food can even be produced in Antarctica, at a price.

The technology is available to meet Africa's needs. The question is whether the political will exists to meet Africa's needs.

Myth II. Africa's wars are inevitable. Africa is not an emerging continent now undergoing a necessary stage of tribal and national conflicts. It is true that colonial degradation and its legacy of artificial boundaries have created potential conflicts. These can only be overcome, however, through concrete economic programs to bring together nations, political forces, and tribal groupings around common goals.

Yet British and American policymaking institutions have made forecasts instead of economic development proposals. They foresee nothing but conflict. At a recent Aspen Institute conference on the political development of Africa in the light of growing East-West tension, civil wars and regional conflicts were the only topics on the agenda. One African representative announced during the conference: "If this is your perspective for Africa, our countries will turn to the East, and work with the Soviets."

The New York Council on Foreign Relations, which staffs and advises both Republican and Democratic administrations, laid out in its "Africa in the 1980s" study an eventful scenario:

As quarreling breaks out everywhere, economies stagnate and authoritarian regimes multiply, since they are best suited to defending scarce and slowly expanding resources from external attack, putting the lid on internal demand and maintaining a con-

stant state of military readiness. Paradoxically, the general postwar exhaustion and unproductiveness that have produced this situation prevent the limited hostilities from becoming widespread conflicts; there is simply not enough tinder to make brushfires a forest fire. As the 1980s draw to an end, the external world decides that Africa is not worth the conquest, and a tacit hands-off agreement is reached, leaving the continent a ghetto to fight its own battles.

The study declines to take up the question of resource development and how new resources are defined. Even with today's levels of technology, the continent's mineral and biological wealth has scarcely been tapped—penalizing the advanced industrialized sector as well as Africa itself.

Myth III. Plagues are 'an act of God.' Control and eradication programs have been successfully carried out in the past against locusts and other infestations. Only wars, social chaos, and lack of investment in such programs of eradication have prevented their application in Africa.

Food and financial policy

The causes of the African emergency are the lack of economic, social and technological development. This lack of development represents an open and deliberate policy. It is not only continuing, but worsening. Africans' ability to feed themselves has deteriorated, and the deterioration has accelerated.

The direction of World Bank policy in Africa

Country	Life expectancy (1978)	Infant mortality*	Child death rate per 1,000 (1978)	External debt (millions of \$) (1978)	Gross int'l reserves (millions of \$) (1978)	Population in millions (1980, projected)	% of labor force in agriculture (1978)	% of labor force in industry (1978)
Mali	42	210	32	539	11	7	88	6
Chad	43	n.a.	30	156	14	5	86	6
Upper Volta	42	263	32	191	39	6	83	12
Niger	42	212	32	194	131	5	91	3
Mauritania	42	n.a.	32	574	82	2	85	5
Senegal	42	93	32	587	23	6	77	8
Uganda	53	160	17	252	n.a.	13	83	6
Sudan	46	n.a.	31	2,076	29	18	79	9
Kenya	53	126	14	953	369	16	79	8
Somalia	43	n.a.	31	496	131	4	82	7
Ethiopia	39	n.a.	37	551	218	33	81	7

* (deaths of infants, under 1 year, per 1,000—1960)

Source: *World Development Report*, World Bank, August 1980

Per capita food production in Africa has been declining by 1.5 percent per year during the last decade. At the end of the second United Nations Development Decade in 1979, an African citizen had on average 10 percent less food available to him than in 1970, and even that was barely adequate for maintaining health. Food shortages and malnutrition will become pandemic if the situation continues.

A look at Africa's overall economic situation explains the current emergency. For the 1960-75 period, nine African countries had annual economic growth rates of 5.8 to 6.9 percent; 22 countries had 1.3 to 1.4 percent growth rates; and 14 countries were stagnating. In 15 countries, the rate of growth of GNP was less than the annual rate of population growth.

Although the physical output of primary commodities increased, income earned from this output decreased or at best stagnated. The oil price increases first initiated by the Henry Kissinger-engineered 1973 Mideast war were perpetuated by the Carter administration's policy of weakening the dollar and forcing OPEC to recoup its losses through price hikes. This energy-cost situation has meant the end of hope for many African countries (see Table 1). In the interim the continent of Africa has been forced through a further devolution.

The IMF method

In Sudan, which has the potential to be the breadbasket of the Arab world, 80 percent of foreign exchange earnings are expended on oil payments and 35 percent on debt service. More than 100 percent of Sudan's foreign exchange is spoken for before one item of capital goods, medicine and so forth is imported.

Ghana, which formerly spent up to one-fifth of its export earnings on oil imports, now spends nine-tenths. Hospitals are closed for lack of basic supplies. Milk has not been seen for more than six months. For lack of foreign exchange, fertilizer consumption has been kept at a low average of 10 kilograms per hectare, compared with a European level of 140 kilograms per hectare; and the volume of imported tractors actually declined during the first half of the 1970s, placing a lid on food production.

Throughout Africa, shortages of maintenance parts have meant that many tractors and other equipment can no longer be used. Warfare and instability have brought private investment to a halt.

Under these circumstances, private bank lending has also ceased, leaving countries with no alternative creditors but the International Monetary Fund and World Bank. The conditional requirements imposed on loans from these institutions spell the death of entire nations.

The cases of Tanzania, Zambia and Zaire are characteristic. Currency devaluations, domestic credit

clamps, reduced government subsidies and service expenditures, and wage austerity are the basic tenets.

In Tanzania, as in many developing countries, the government is the main importer. Devaluation increases import costs which in turn must be passed on to purchasers, generating social unrest. Although a country's export goods become cheaper on the world market after devaluation, exports generally consist of agricultural goods for which prices and market demand are already low. Rising import costs and often outright import restrictions prevent the country in question from developing any other means of export earnings.

Rising import costs and import restrictions prevent existing technologies from being used. In Zambia, it would appear that even bicycles are no longer considered "appropriate technology"; more than half the country's bicycles do not function for lack of spare parts.

It is no wonder that the IMF and World Bank are detested and dreaded in Africa. They would rather commit genocide than create and expand a productive economy. They, and those industrial-sector policymakers who have allowed them free rein in Africa, are responsible for the fact that Africa cannot now feed itself.

Another global institution which has shaped the African catastrophe is the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization. A Malthusian outlook guides many aspects of its work. FAO representatives have said they will consider the industrialization of African countries only when the countries "run out of land." In other words, bringing Africa into the 20th and 21st centuries is neither possible nor desirable for the FAO. Africa must rely on the same technologies, or lack of technologies, that have shown themselves incapable of feeding today's population, let alone the next decades'.

There can in fact be no modern rural or agricultural development without concomitant industrial development. How will fertilizers, tractors, pesticides, irrigation equipment and so forth be provided? They cannot be imported under present African balance of payments conditions. So-called appropriate technologies—improved digging sticks, oxen- or pedal-driven mills, and the like are incapable of providing the energy levels required for increased productivity. Yet one of the IMF conditionalities for Zambia was to place more emphasis on this kind of "rural development" at the expense of "industrialization."

Condemned to death

Africans themselves well understand that their continent is being deliberately condemned to death. Prof. Adebayo Adedji, Executive Secretary of the U.N. Economic Commission for Africa, said recently:

After 20 years of independence, the African economy today is not only underdeveloped but also deteriorating fast. . . . Almost all the global projections of the world economy for the year 2000 foresee nothing but bleak prospects for Africa. Indeed, paradoxical as it may sound, if these projections are to be believed, the 1960s and the 1970s may by the 1980s appear to have been a golden age.

Organization of African Unity Secretary General Edem Kodju has stated: "According to very reliable estimates, only nine or ten of our states will be able to survive in the years to come. . . . Africa is dying."

The "international institutions"—the IMF/World Bank, the Club of Rome, the Brandt Commission on Development—claim the cause of poverty and devastation is the "population monster." Robert McNamara replied last October to the late Yugoslav President Tito's statement that the main problem in the world is in the sphere of North-South economic relations: "The main problem in the world is overpopulation. Either birth rates will decline or mortality rates will increase," the latter through war "in a thermonuclear age." As a leading executive member of the American Association of the Club of Rome noted: "We have to resign ourselves to the fact that there will be 6 billion people in the world by the year 2000. There is no way to avoid that—barring major catastrophes and wars."

At Nuremberg, genocide was a crime against humanity, and people were sentenced to hanging for it. Now thinly veiled euphemisms such as "catastrophes" are used to erode human rationality and morality, and to gain acceptance for the "reduction of the world population as necessary."

Relief needs and relief supplies

The United Nations and other present or potential food aid sources have acted in consonance with this perspective. In July 1980 the Director General of the FAO estimated that approximately 84 million tons of cereals needed to be imported to stave off starvation and malnourishment on a global level. As he noted, many of the affected countries are not in a position to import the necessary quantities because of shortage of foreign exchange earnings. He commented that the plight of some nations was "without solution." He thus called upon the United Nations to be generous. Food aid at present amounts to nearly the equivalent of 9 million tons of cereals. The U.N. emergency food reserve scheme has not yet managed to reach its annual target of half a million tons of cereals.

Present world cereal stocks amount to about 60 days worth of food, i.e., about 17 percent of world consumption. But that leaves no room for complacency, as the FAO reckons that if cereal stocks fall below about 45 days' worth (i.e., 13 percent of global consumption), the global food chain will begin to break down. Mills will experience grain shortages and gaps will appear on the shelves.

For the immediate emergency in Africa, U.S. Department of Agriculture officials estimate that 1.6 million metric tons of grain imported over the next 12 months would enable normal dietary requirements of eight east African countries to be met. They estimated that half of this required amount could be purchased by the countries themselves, and only 0.8 million metric tons, which the United States has left over in its grain reserves from last year's bumper harvest, would have to be supplied as relief. This is an inadequate estimate; so is the calculation of normal "dietary requirements." There was even a disagreement over the actual needs of Ethiopia despite U.N. confirmation of the figures.

Proposal for action

EIR contributing editor Lyndon LaRouche has called for the immediate upgrading of estimated requirements to 18 million metric tons of grain, rice and dried milk, to provide an adequate dietary allowance and cover other African needs. He proposes that the full amount be purchased by the U.S. Commodity Credit Corporation from American farmers at parity prices. The grain must be shipped along with personnel and vehicles required for its distribution, so that those relief agencies who have sabotaged emergency aid in the past will be unable to divert quick supply to starving populations.

LaRouche also specified that long-term programs must be immediately established to provide the capital for investment in the infrastructure, agricultural and industrial technology, education and health and energy resources required to develop Africa's productive potential.

After a freeze on debt owed to the IMF-World Bank, a rescheduling of government-to-government debt can be negotiated, based on the understanding that new investment will vastly expand Africa's revenue base.

Given that political commitment, the Fusion Energy Foundation has estimated that over the next decade \$1 trillion can be profitably spent in Africa, concentrated in developing "nuplexes"—industrial and agricultural centers based on energy-dense power sources, mainly nuclear, to achieve economies of scale and to overcome the population diffusion and low skill levels that will hinder Africa's growth even after nutritional and other consumption needs are met.