

# **Economic growth, not 'food control,' will save lives**

by Marcia Merry

In 1974, then-Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, speaking at the founding meeting of the World Food Council in Rome, called for international action for "national food security." He also went to the 29th General Assembly of the United Nations, and demanded sweeping powers for the U.N. Disaster Relief Office (UNDRO). Kissinger cried crocodile tears about hungry children, and schemes were set in motion to realize his stated food objectives. Fifteen years later, what is the result? Millions of dead and dying. In Africa, the death toll is on the scale of genocide. This is the outcome of years of "food control" policies, so perverse, so extensive, that the world has never before seen evil on such a scale. During the 1970s, initiatives were thwarted that had stemmed from the postwar "Atoms for Peace" period of building energy and infrastructure to improve economic conditions. In the false name of charity, a network of supranational agencies was created to undermine national development programs, and serving as food and population control mechanisms. These agencies include the U.N. High Commission for Refugees, the U.S. Committee for Refugees, UNDRO, and sections of the Red Cross.

This is the story behind the devastation now sweeping Africa. Despite the colonialist past, the new states of postwar Africa were experiencing growing rates of agricultural output up through the 1970s. Infrastructure projects were on the books to spur rapid economic growth. The hydraulic projects called for diverting some of the vast flow of the Congo River Basin northward to expand and stabilize Lake Chad. They also sought to capture much more of the meandering waters of the upper White Nile, lost in the swamps, by means of the Jonglei Canal, to increase the water flow to the rich lands downstream in Sudan and Egypt (see map). There were plans for hydroelectric and nuclear power, transcontinental rail grids, and sanitation projects. By the 1980s, all of these projects were stopped. Per capita food output has dropped in Africa over the past 15 years, and food-surplus regions have become dependent on imports.

Sudan exemplifies the situation. The largest nation in Africa, with 23 million



United Nations/Leslie Jenkins

*Eritrean refugees poured into Sudan during the 1985 famine. Despite (or because of) its tremendous food-growing potential, Sudan is targeted for destruction by the one-world government crowd.*

people, it is one of the best-endowed agricultural regions on the globe. The grain output potential of the Sudan could meet all the needs of the Middle East and much of Africa combined. The nation became independent of Britain in 1956. Many development projects were initiated, and in the the 1970s work began on the Jonglei Canal. The objective was to increase both output per acre, and the number of acres producing.

Then came the concerted action of the 1970s to shut this all down. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) placed harsh conditionalities on credit, demanding an end to food subsidies. Inputs of fertilizer and machinery fell. The cotton for export in 1980 was half of what it was in 1970. The IMF and World Bank even decreed that wheat was not "suitable" for Sudan. In terms of agronomy, this is equivalent to saying that corn isn't right for Iowa. The bankers were protecting the grainbelts of North America, Australia, and elsewhere for their own food control power through the grain cartel (Cargill, Bunge, Continental, Louis Dreyfus, ADM, André).

From being a grain exporter, Sudan became an importer. There were food riots in 1980-81. The currency was repeatedly devalued. Poverty and social unrest spread. When at the beginning, all parties favored such a project as the Jonglei Canal, later rebels turned against it under pressure and inducements from foreign intervention. Finally civil war broke out again, along the north-south lines that the British colonialists had fomented. With little variation, this is the background to all the warfare now sweeping the continent. Millions have been made refugees.

Now into the situation come the neocolonial networks using "relief" as a rationalization for takeover, and for obliteration of populations. Again, look at Sudan. After Khartoum refused to side with Bush in the Persian Gulf, Washington gave orders Oct. 2 for a ship laden with 45,000 tons of U.S. grain—a contracted, commercial sale—to divert course to Kenya instead. The IMF officially declared the Sudan to be a "non-cooperating" member, and cut off credit. Now, U.S. officials are waiting to ask Congress for a trade embargo.

The stated reason? The Sudan is not complying with the international "relief" community, in how to deal with its food shortfall. After two years of poor rains, and decades of suppressed development, Sudan has a food gap. The response of the West? Use food control to destroy Sudan.

The blueprint for these atrocities was presented in the book *International Disaster Relief: Towards a Responsive System*, which was one of 30 studies done by the "1980s Project" of the New York Council on Foreign Relations. The book uses the language of the new fascism: "National sovereignty—or an interpretation of it which has in fact been shaped by the narrow, self-perceived interests of a small group of politicians—has in these ways frequently caused thousands of needless deaths and greatly increased the impact of disasters on the 'normal' development process." The CFR calls for the media, relief organizations, and U.N. agencies to mobilize against national sovereignty in Africa on the issue of food. The reports below show that only economic development, is the basis for prosperity and peace.