

went on that line, under the influence of the Soviet Union, and the industrial policy that Algeria chose was influenced by this ideological position. So we have to put this in the historical context of the '60s and '70s.

The model taken by Algeria had two major points. One was the agricultural policy, which was shown to have been catastrophic. We see the results of this even now. The second one was industrial policy. The agricultural policy was an abstract policy based on the so-called self-management (Yugoslavian) model. It didn't reflect the special rural history of Algerian society. It didn't seek to respect the peasants in their tradition of cultivating the land, with the many centuries of Mediterranean traditions. Instead of respecting these traditions, they introduced the model from the so-called popular democracies of eastern Europe, according to Soviet ideology. This is the point I emphasize—abstract, when you compare it to realities in Algeria.

The industrial policy was also abstract. "Industrializing industry" for its own sake was the formula used by the experts at that time. This, of course, was totally disconnected from the economic and industrial realities of the '60s and '70s, because when Algeria produced steel, to whom could they sell? To France? To Germany? Then they had the idea of selling it to Africa, which also failed. So it was absolutely abstract. It was not based on the realities of industry in the European societies in the '60s and '70s. Now it is commonly recognized in Algeria, even by the rulers, that it had been a big mistake. They are trying to repair it.

**EIR:** Based on this Soviet model, was agricultural policy collectivized, and did it suffer under this policy?

**Arkoun:** Yes, they collectivized all the land and distributed it to new so-called peasants, who had no relationship to the land. Now land is more and more owned privately. Now they have come back to the situation as it existed prior to the agricultural revolution, which was initiated in the beginning of the '70s under Boumediene.

When the French colonists left Algeria, they left much of the richest land, which the government distributed to Algerians. But they gave it to Algerians who had no knowledge of how to cultivate the earth. They collectivized according to the Yugoslav model of "self-management," and it did not work at all. This is one of the major failures of the economic policy in Algeria in the '60s and '70s.

Now they have gone back to the situation as before, because now they realize their policy was made according to an abstract ideology they wanted to apply by force. Algeria was not the originator of all these ideas. We always had independent owners. There has also been the colonial effect on the land because the French colonists took the land, and many Algerians had been marginalized in agricultural life during the French period. But the government made it worse. So the rural history of Algeria in the 19th century is also a

very important point to study, to show the effect of the colonial period and of the agrarian revolution during the '60s and '70s, to explain what the difficulty is today.

**EIR:** What is the alternative?

**Arkoun:** There is an urgent need to rethink the necessary conditions for a new economic policy, taking into account the triumph of the liberal market economy dominated by the seven big industrialized powers. I do not see any way for equal exchange between the seven big industrialized powers and the Third World countries; there is a tragic political crisis everywhere; no legitimacy and no possibility to engage in a democratic process. [French Prime Minister Michel] Rocard said that France cannot help the misery of the whole world; one can ask only if there is a place for political responsibility on behalf of the big seven.

There is no way to establish an Arab Common Market, or a Maghreb Common Market; everything depends on the solidarity of Europe with the Third World. But Europe is not

## LaRouche addresses the nations of Africa

*This open letter from Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. was released on Sept. 1:*

I am aware, in a general and I believe efficient way, of the nature of the suffering which all of sub-Saharan Africa suffers today in one degree or another, but with all parts of sub-Saharan Africa facing the same ultimate fate unless something is done to reverse the present situation.

The situation in Africa is not an accident. It is not like some mysterious disease which came upon us without human foreknowledge, of which we must discover a cure. The crisis of Africa, especially sub-Saharan Africa, is the product of a *willfully malicious determination* to destroy and depopulate that continent along the lines specified by not only John Ruskin's Cecil Rhodes, with his plan for making Africa a safe place for the *bwana makuts*, or the "big hunters," but the policy of the late evil Bertrand Russell, a man often thought to be a friend of the poor and weak, but actually their deadliest enemy, by his own declaration in his commitment to use disease and other means to more efficiently depopulate the world of those populations whose skin colors were darker than pleased Mr. Russell and his friends.

willing to consider this solidarity for the moment.

**EIR:** They appear to be thinking of it only in negative terms.

**Arkoun:** Yes, with the crisis of legitimacy, the big economic failure, the economic crisis in the big seven, problems of migrants, closing frontiers—all these facts converge to impose a negative image and a pessimistic view of the future. I come back to European humanism. What does it mean today? How can one conceive its actualization in Europe and outside? No place for moral considerations, not even for an economic, financial order. Europe does not speak this language. I think we are going to undergo tragic events, unless Europe is successful and overcomes its present crisis.

We have to correct this. Because it's not all negative. It can be shown that there are also positive aspects, for example, the younger generation, which is ready to engage itself in the economic reconceptualization of the development of

Europe. They may contribute to this, as the Turks did in Germany, as well as the North Africans in France, in the 1960s and '70s. They called them to come and to work on their farms and in their industry. But now they say they don't need this. It can be a way of cooperation. Why not open it? It is possible.

Europeans have to understand that in the Mediterranean area, there are forces operating and these forces are totally unequal, unbalanced. These forces are creating huge political and economic problems, and they have to be considered seriously for the next 10 years, because it is a situation once again of domination, not of cooperation. In an extremely important area like the Mediterranean, I think this is very bad. The Mediterranean region is a European problem, it is not an Arabic problem, or a Middle Eastern problem, or a problem of Islam. I don't know any European who would reject the importance of Mediterranean culture as a basis of European culture; I don't know anyone who would deny this. . . .

As an economist, I know what could be done for Africa. With relatively modest means, a gigantic improvement could have been effected any time we wished over the past 20 years. That I know, from studies I have done. I know that Africa could more than feed itself, if the development were supplied. Simple basic economic infrastructure in water development, in transportation, in energy production, in health care—that is, particularly in control of disease and treatment—and in education, combined with a relatively modest amount of direct assistance to farmers to improve their technology, their production, and their land, and to essential industries, would start the process of development rolling, under which Africa, and sub-Saharan Africa in particular, could be relieved from a brutalization from the outside which I know as an historian to have been going on since at least the 700-800 A.D. period of the present Christian era. That could be done. And it *must* be done.

We have a similar situation, not as grievous, in Central and South America, where similar policies are being applied to people who speak Spanish or Portuguese, by and large. Similar plans are projected by the same evil forces for Asia. They think Asia is overpopulated, and they intend to use war, famine, and epidemic as a means of bringing those populations down.

We must recognize, that the failure of nations to band together to provide justice for Africa, is bringing chaos upon the planet as a whole. Because negligence, denial of the human rights of one part of the human race, opens the door to denial of those same rights for all men of the

human race.

In Africa, we must do what we can with the means available to both Africans and others of good will from outside of Africa for this purpose. But we must recognize, that we must band together on this issue, and we must draw in from Central and South America, from Asia, and from Europe and elsewhere, those who must recognize, as we do, that the fate of Africa today may be the fate of the entire planet tomorrow.

Only with that kind of conscience do I believe that we will reverse the kinds of policies which Robert McNamara in particular brought into the World Bank, which was the beginning of the new version of the present holocaust in Africa. And only if we reverse that general opinion, that sympathy for McNamara's World Bank policy—*eliminate that* from the institutions of Europe, Asia, and Central and South America, as well as Europe and North America—only in that case is there going to be the kind of long-term solution for African peoples and African nations which is a just one.

So we must act now to do what we can, with the means available. We must unify ourselves, those who are committed to this, to achieve what is achievable. We must at the same time realize that there is no durable solution for this problem, but only short-term amelioration, unless we can draw in the concern of the peoples of Europe, of North America, of Central and South America, and Asia, and draw them in if on no higher moral purpose, than the realization that what happens to Africa today, can happen to them tomorrow.