

household, and per land area—is primary, and represents the only pathway for developing countries to progress to the pre-1964 level of the modern agro-industrial nation-state. When a country has a large percentage of its labor force involved in relatively inefficient methods of farming, the only way to substantially increase productivity, measured in yield per hectare, is through investment in the targeted areas that we have identified. Over time, progress is made evident by the slight, but significant, shifts in employment from the rural-agricultural sector into the urban-based, capital-intensive industrial sector, which to date the Asian Tigers have failed to accomplish.

For a ‘New, Just World Economic Order’

Nigeria should raise its voice and join the growing chorus around the world to demand the fundamental reforms for a “New, Just World Economic Order.” This is as much a fight for freedom and the inalienable rights of all men today, as Nigeria’s enduring fight for freedom and against apartheid in South Africa was until 1993. At the same time, Nigeria must protect its own economy, and chart a course of economic development to reach full industrialization and modern standards of agricultural production in the decades to come. This course of action is also the precondition for establishing meaningful, constitutional, republican forms of democracy. Simply put, there cannot be democracy, if we attach any significant meaning to the term, unless we have a process of economic development which reaches into the pores of every village.

The axioms of such a new economic system are already well established in natural law. Since political economies, organized as commonwealths, exist for the successful propagation of the human species at qualitatively and quantitatively higher levels of existence, and this is only possible by creating a culture that concentrates on nurturing the innate creative potential of each newborn child, then the correct economic policy is obvious. We support those policies that help each individual to realize those divinely bestowed human qualities that make each life sacred. Likewise, any economic policy which leads to unnecessary loss of life, or otherwise harms, degrades, or causes needless suffering to any individual, must be rejected as antithetical to the interests of the human race. We care nothing for so-called market forces or free-trade gobbledygook, since the implementation of these ideologies has consistently failed to develop any nation, or to help improve the well-being of any people.

We should now proceed to embrace these new ideas, which we know with scientific certainty will finally lift up the African continent, and enable its over 600 million people to regain the respect, dignity, and justice that has heretofore been stolen from them. Let the great continent of Africa, with Nigeria at its helm, enter the twenty-first century as an equal to the rest of the world. Finally, let us all support these profound and beautiful words, written by Pope Paul VI back in 1967, “Let the new name for peace be development.”

Ford Foundation and bankers try to block Nigerian sovereignty

by Lydia Cherry

The Nigerian government has on several recent occasions announced its intention to get greater control over four of the country’s biggest banks. This discussion has apparently added to the concern of the bankrupt British and U.S. bankers about Nigeria’s independent economic course. Thus, the campaign to bring Africa’s most populous country under the control of a more “reasonable” figure—such as longtime Ford Foundation board member Gen. Olusegun Obasanjo—is gathering steam. (Obasanjo is now under house arrest in Nigeria for his suspected role in an unsuccessful coup attempt, thought to have been steered by British intelligence circles.)

London’s *Financial Times* has written numerous articles on how the Abacha government’s moves to gain control of Nigeria’s own banks is “worrying foreign investors.” Nigerian Finance Minister Anthony Ani explained in an interview with the Nigerian daily *Thisday* the first week in May that the Nigerian government had decided to reestablish “a presence” in the banks First Bank Plc., Union Bank Plc, United Bank for Africa Plc (UBA), and Africabank Plc, primarily because “the banks are next only to the central bank in terms of size and importance to the country.”

An independent economic course by Nigeria, against the prescriptions of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), would offer a model for the rest of Africa. But the bankers’ “concern” is not just that; the idea of a country getting control of its own economic system is anathema in the current period of economic collapse, where the name of the game is to suck out whatever is of value, to prop up the mounds of worthless paper disguised as an international economic system.

Following an unsuccessful coup attempt in March, the U.S. side of the same operation is attempting to flex its muscle to force President William Clinton to make a “Haiti” out of Nigeria. The campaign has particularly been launched by the sections of the “human rights” mafia that claim membership in the New York Council on Foreign Relations (CFR)—affiliated with London’s Royal Institute for International Affairs—and are bankrolled by the Ford Foundation. One person who fits this classification is the radical lobbyist in a three-piece suit, Randall Robinson, the director of

TransAfrica.

Robinson in late March announced that his well-heeled organization will concentrate its fire-power exclusively on Nigeria, as it earlier did on South Africa and then Haiti. TransAfrica is now urging the Clinton administration to impose an oil boycott on Nigeria. Some Nigerians living in the United States are critical of this campaign, and suspicious of Robinson. This was reflected in a full-page *New York Times* ad on April 21, purchased by 27 Nigerian organizations—a “friendly” open letter to Robinson that was timed to coincide with TransAfrica’s first “sit-in” at the Nigerian embassy. Among the recommendations the letter made was for Robinson to stop “proffering simplistic solutions to the problems of a country you have never visited.” It added: “We realize that an organization such as yours needs a popular, emotional cause to remain functional, and relevant. We know that without such a cause, your ability to raise funds is greatly hindered. We do not begrudge your fundraising schemes . . . but in the name of thousands of your ancestors from Africa, do not use Nigeria for any such selfish purposes.”

TransAfrica’s keepers

Although TransAfrica was put on course with the help of numerous foundations and individuals, the role of the Ford Foundation deserves special mention. The Ford Foundation is the largest U.S. foundation “by total giving,” with assets of \$6,253,006,737. It has 227 full-time professionals employed in its activities, which apparently include the destabilization of governments. It has no affiliation with the historic Ford family, having been officially disavowed by the Fords after it was taken over by the CFR apparatus. It is the one foundation that funnels hundreds of thousands of dollars each year to the Royal Institute of International Affairs in London. Of the 12 people who are either Ford Foundation officers or on its board: 1) Seven sit on one or more boards of directors of now-collapsing banks, Dow Jones, or economic schools, such as Wharton School; 2) four sit on the board of AT&T; 3) four are members of the Council on Foreign Relations; 4) eleven are listed in *Who’s Who in America*.

What is this great commitment to a “democratic” Nigeria among this illustrious group?

Randall Robinson was a Ford Foundation fellow in 1970-71 in Tanzania. The idea for TransAfrica reportedly was germinated from a Black Leadership Conference convened by the Congressional Black Caucus in September 1976. An ad hoc committee was set up to formulate an organizational design and investigate funding possibilities. The committee consisted of Robinson, Hershelle Challenor, and Willard Johnson. Challenor, like Randall Robinson, is a member of the CFR. Also like Robinson, Challenor had previously worked for the Ford Foundation. When TransAfrica was officially founded in July 1977, it was with startup funding from the Ford Foundation and the National Council of

Churches. The World Council of Churches and its U.S. branch, the NCC, were built up by the Rockefellers, the Dulles brothers—the same crowd that took over the Ford Foundation—and their associates in Great Britain. The links between the WCC and the Ford Foundation are still close; today, for example, the Ford Foundation funds the Sudanese Council of Churches, in southern Sudan. It is generally believed that not only the funds, but also the placement of trustees and directors on the WCC/NCC governing boards, are controlled by the heads of Ford and other foundations.

Tall tales from Human Rights Watch

Although TransAfrica is given impressive media play as the organization that brought down apartheid in South Africa and will root out the military from Nigeria, two other U.S. institutions are devoting more of their resources to attempting to destabilize Nigeria: 1) the right-wing social democratic funding apparatus controlled by George Bush’s crowd, the National Endowment for Democracy; and 2) Human Rights Watch, an organization described by Thailand’s former Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman in April 1993 as “a front for the CIA . . . that uses human rights as a means to make unfounded charges to extract and extort economic or political concessions.”

On March 27, a widely distributed Human Rights Watch-Africa press release, “First Ever Testimony by Nigerian Soldiers on the Military Campaign in Ogoniland,” made it clear that the Watches had turned their guns on Nigeria. The Ogoni cause is intended to split off Ogoniland from the rest of Nigeria.

Human Rights Watch devoted little of their resources to Nigeria during the eight-year period when Gen. Ibrahim Babangida was keeping the country on an IMF course. The current executive director of Human Rights Watch-Africa is Abdullahi An-Na’im, who is part of the Sudanese opposition movement headquartered in London. Directly prior to taking up the leadership of Human Rights Watch-Africa, he was a visiting fellow for the Ford Foundation in Cairo.

The National Endowment for Democracy on May 1-2 hosted its Fifth World Conference on Democracy, which included Nigerians on NED’s payroll. NED officials have pledged to use their influence to shift the Clinton administration into a more hardline position vis-à-vis Nigeria. It was said by the Nigerian opposition spokesmen that the Clinton administration’s ambassador to Nigeria, Walter C. Carrington, is “soft” on the Abacha government.

The NED gave \$50,000 of the money they get from U.S. AID to the dissident Campaign for Democracy in Nigeria last year. The money went to financing an unsuccessful campaign of strikes and chaos to force the Abacha government to turn over the reins of power to the former ITT head who had promised to bring Nigeria back into the IMF fold, Moshood Abiola. The president of NED is Carl Gershman, a member of the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith.