

## **EIR Feature**

# **Horn of Africa in the cross-hairs of 'new world order'**

by Marcia Merry

Less publicized even than the wanton destruction of innocent life in Iraq, as a result of Anglo-American-led military actions and the sanctions, has been the way that George Bush's "new world order" is shattering the fragile economic and political tissue of the Horn of Africa—Sudan, Ethiopia, Somalia, and Djibouti.

Since late May, close to 240,000 Ethiopian refugees have fled to Sudan, occasioned by the fall of the Haile Mengistu Miriam government. A few weeks earlier, some 2 million refugees left Somalia for neighboring Kenya, Djibouti, and Ethiopia, after the Siad Barre government was overthrown. At the outset of 1991, there were already 1 million refugees in Sudan. Since January, the U.N. refugee food program in Somalia has been suspended.

The Horn of Africa is one of the areas in the world most affected by the refugee crisis, which involves 17 million refugees worldwide, according to a U.N. High Commission report. Apart from refugees, millions of the 86 million residents in the Horn are in dire need of water, food, and health care. The crisis is the culmination of recent years of worsening poverty under economic dictates of the International Monetary Fund, with the connivance of the Soviet Union in Ethiopia, and the United States, Israel, and other powers throughout the region.

On June 6 and 7, in Washington, D.C., the embassy of the Republic of the Sudan issued a news release titled "The New Foundations for Political Stability and National Development," which stated in part: "The strategic position of Sudan at the crossroads of Africa and the Middle East enables the country to play its role as a link between these two important areas. Historically, Sudan has always been the route that carried West African pilgrims to the holy lands in Arabia, and Darbal-Arbaeen across the Sudanese western desert was one of the major trade avenues linking Egypt to the Islamic Kingdoms in West Africa. Moreover, the Fashoda Incident that brought France and Great Britain to the brink of war at the end of the nineteenth century was yet another proof of the strategic importance of the country."



*Eritrean refugees in Sudan. Millions of refugees are criss-crossing the region in search of food, shelter, and political asylum, while the United Nations and the Western industrial powers look the other way—or worse.*

In 1898, at Fashoda on the upper White Nile River, French forces capitulated to the British commander, Lord Kitchener, on orders from Paris. This “catamite submission to the London sodomites became, over the coming few years, the Entente Cordiale,” U.S. presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche observed in a July 6 campaign statement. LaRouche recounted of the 1898 events, that “this British alliance with France, against the interests of the rest of continental Europe, linked up with the crisis in the Balkans, and linked up with a fight within the ruling circles in Russia, to create all the preconditions for what became very soon World War I. And, out of the unresolved issues of World War I, and the terrible mistakes made at Versailles, among the principal factors, we got World War II.”

He explained that the British “saw in the rise of German economic power not only a powerful economic competitor, whom they were determined to crush for just that reason—as they had crushed France earlier. But they saw France as a linchpin between those in France, such as France’s great minister Gabriel Hanotaux, and Russia’s great minister Sergei Count Witte, who proposed such projects as Hanotaux’s plan for a railroad system to connect France with Vladivostok on the Pacific. At the same time, of course, the French had a railroad project which had been projected in the 1870s: a railroad across the African Sahel—that is, black Africa—from Dakar to Djibouti, which would have meant that black Africa would have begun serious economic development, and not be left in miserable backwardness, as it has. Both railroad projects were

crushed, implicitly, by an unfortunate change in power in Paris, in the late 1890s,” when a British asset, Delcassé, replaced Hanotaux’s leadership.

Today, with automated track-laying, magnetically levitated propulsion, and other modern methods, the kinds of projects abandoned at Fashoda are as feasible as they are necessary. LaRouche counsels leaders to think in terms of “building up the economic geography” in the four main regions of Africa’s economic potential: the rainforest, with Nigeria on the west, and Kenya to the east; the African Shield, rich in agriculture potential and minerals; the northern Africa coastal regions; and the Sahel (including the Horn), with highly variable rainfall, but a perfect locale for an “oasis program” of man-made rivers and lakes. Specific to each region, the requirements are: state-of-the-art infrastructure, favoring agriculture and small firms; waterways and railways, with auxiliary highways; power; and, especially, communications within the continent.

Such infrastructural development will foster the kind of economic growth which can ensure sovereign nations and individual freedom. Instead, as the report below shows, a neo-colonial policy with the same terrible dangers as those that ensued from Fashoda, is now being pursued by the Bush administration and Congress, following a script from the New York Council on Foreign Relations’ *1980s Project*, which called for U.S. foreign policy to render target populations food-dependent. This is the rationale behind U.S. stress now on “humanitarian” rather than development aid.