

# 'New' World Bank plan for Africa: Part of Mondale's starvation plan

by Christopher White

During the course of the just concluded annual conference of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the Fund's sister organization, the World Bank, issued the third in its series of reports on sub-Saharan Africa. The latest is called "Toward the Sustained Development of Sub-Saharan Africa, A Joint Program of Action."

The title of the document is, of course, a typical rhetorician's trick. The document is not about development at all, never mind what normal people would consider to be implied by the term "sustained" development. In fact the very opposite is the stated intent of the recommendations presented in the report's introduction, and elaborated in the text. And that is not actually surprising, for the name "sustained development" is one of the buzz words put into international circulation by the crowd around the Club of Rome genocide lobby, and their U.S. friends, like Orville Freeman of Business International, who runs not only a slice of Walter Mondale, but also the Agency for International Development of the current Reagan administration, through that agency's adoption of Business International's program to deal with the world food crisis. That proposal in turn won a \$30,000 prize at a 1982 Woodlawn "Sustainable Societies" conference. AID is responsible, with the Department of State and the U.S. Department of Agriculture, for the implementation of what is euphemistically called U.S. food aid policies.

The basic thesis of the World Bank report, and of the policy that Freeman, together with his assistant Ruth Karen, put together for AID, is quite simple. There are too many people living in sub-Saharan Africa. That is, too many black people. Or, what Business International calls, to avoid the opprobrium of words like "native," as Karen herself put it in a recent discussion, "indigenous population." The recommendations contained in the World Bank report are part of a global blue-print for population reduction, that is, genocide, especially against black, brown, and yellow-skinned peoples. And the cited agencies of the U.S. government are helping to implement it.

For example, on page 26, the report's authors assert:

The impact of continued high fertility can be shown by an example: The estimated population in the year 2020 of over 1.2 billion could be reduced to less than 900 million—

still a staggering figure—if a rapid decline in fertility were possible immediately. . . .

Unfortunately, few African countries have committed themselves to reducing population growth. Some governments are even pro-natalist; Sudan, for example, recently announced its intention to introduce incentives for large families.

Four of the points of the nine-point program put forward by the bank are the following:

- Health and other programs to reduce the rate of population growth
- Changes in the structure of education and training to ensure greater relevance to the needs of African economies
- Budgetary and pricing policies (including correction for the overvaluation of exchange rates) that will switch the internal terms of trade within Africa toward agriculture
- Greater emphasis on smallholders rather than large farms.

The genocidal concerns expressed in these four points are reflected elsewhere in the report, in the development of the classic thesis of Malthusianism, that while Sub-Saharan Africa has maintained the highest population growth rate globally, its capacity to produce food, as measured in per capita production of grains, for example, in 24 drought-stricken African countries, declined during the period between 1970 and 1984 by about 2% a year. Projections of per capita production for the year 1984 employed by the bank anticipate a decline to below a production level of 100 kilograms of grains per person. The report further notes that 1 in 5 of the entire population of the area is fed by imports. And that the 1 in 5 ratio is, on average, the ratio of city-dwellers to people living in the countryside.

The report notes in passing, on page 13, that sub-Saharan Africa's import capacity, that is, the region's capacity to import food, is declining, without recommending how to either reverse that decline, or increase internal production of foodstuffs. The question that is then left is, does the World Bank intend to wipe out sub-Saharan Africa's urban

population, or 20% of the total population, over the period ahead? This in turn must be seen with the added knowledge of the collapse of food production, including production of grains, within the United States, a collapse which this publication has shown has been organized to achieve precisely the result intended by the World Bank for sub-Saharan Africa.

Yet even if the rural population were capable of producing food, which the per capita production declines show is not the case, the World Bank does not intend that food be available to be eaten.

The report emphasizes repeatedly recommendations such as the following:

Fuller use of existing capacity in all sectors—agriculture, power, education, health and industry (except for projects that have been costly mistakes and should be written off).

Or again:

Financing big infrastructure projects has represented a large part of past donor programs. These programs must be re-examined. Even ongoing projects need to be reviewed with governments to ensure that their completion at this stage of extreme shortage of resources is still desirable.

The hostility expressed toward infrastructure programs, which includes praise for countries that have been forced to eliminate programs such as highway construction, which would make possible the development of an internal division of labor, is expressed more generally toward industry as “industry becomes a burden on the more efficient and dynamic parts of the economy.”

But if Africa cannot have infrastructure, and it cannot have industry, because the people who run the World Bank, along with their friends like Orville Freeman and AID say so, then Africa cannot have food. And if Africa cannot have food, Africa dies. And meanwhile the World Bank turns its attention to trees.

Fuelwood consumption alone now exceeds the growth of new trees by a factor of ten in Mauritania and Rwanda, by five in Kenya, by about two and a half in Ethiopia, Nigeria, and Tanzania. Much can be done to reduce the demand for fuel-wood. . . .

After large-scale infrastructure projects, which would include energy, have been taken away, and after the industry, which would process raw materials into useful forms, has also been taken away, the World Bank also proposes to take away the trees.

The price of fuelwood seldom reflects replacement costs—and is unlikely to do so until available resources are used up, or until governments can collect stumpage fees to cover replacement costs. (page 32).

The report presented is the third in a series. The World Bank began to give its attention to Africa, in this way, after the heads of state of Africa's nations met in 1980 and drafted a plan for the development of the continent. The plan was known as the Lagos Plan of Action. In the United States it was reviewed, at book-length, by Lyndon LaRouche, Independent Democratic presidential candidate. The Lagos Action Plan attempted to put the question of the necessity for the development of Africa before the world community and its leaders. Except for the efforts undertaken by LaRouche and his wife Helga, through such forums as the Club of Life and its international efforts to mobilize support to reverse the deadly continent-wide food shortage, it is the case that the proposals put forward in the successive World Bank reports have been the policy of practice of advanced-sector governments—including emphatically that of the United States—with the exception of Japan. Africa has been condemned to death, and outside the organizations associated with the LaRouches, the international community of nations and its leadership have not uttered a word of dissent, or lifted a finger in protest.

### **A model for the world**

Yet, at this year's International Monetary Fund conference, the proposal for Africa was presented, not just as directed at Africa, but as a model for the world as a whole. The proposal contains not only a blueprint for genocide, by eliminating a whole continent's capacity to feed itself, it also contains a series of administrative reform proposals modelled on the practice of classical 19th-century imperialism, which would ensure that the survivors of the re-colonized populations are again reduced to near-slavery conditions. It is in this area also that the report is touted as a model for other parts of the world.

The task of aid coordination is time consuming and administratively demanding. The agencies chairing the aid coordination groups will need to provide much more technical assistance to governments for preparing their public investment and recurrent expenditure programs, as well as for designing the supporting policy changes. . . . Strengthening the Bank's role would require additional manpower to work closely with governments and other donors, including staff in the recipient country.

The World Bank is evidently not satisfied that local administrators will have the stomach to implement plans for mass murder on a scale 100 times worse than anything Hitler dreamed of, and therefore proposes that it should take over the functions of government in the nations targeted for treatment according to its genocidal prescriptions. Let us instead make Africa an example of how the World Bank and its allies can be defeated, the better to demonstrate our capacity to save ourselves.