

# U.S. pushes World Bank's Africa plan

by Linda de Hoyos

The United States delegation to the United Nations Second Committee concerned with economic matters is working to turn this year's committee deliberations into enforced approval of the World Bank report "Toward the Sustained Development of Sub-Saharan Africa." That report outlines a genocide blueprint for Africa.

The signal for this was the speech of Ambassador Alan L. Keyes, alternate U.S. representative, before the U.N. Second Committee on Oct. 12. Keyes adopted the genocidal attitude of the World Bank in all his proposals, with one additional feature: Whereas the World Bank is a supranational financial institution, Keyes speaks for the political power of the United States to politically and militarily enforce World Bank plans.

Keyes opened his speech with a protest directed to those who justifiably complain that the U.N. has made no headway in aiding the economies of the underdeveloped sector or in alleviating the onerous debt burden that, in particular, the starving African nations face. On the contrary, Keyes claimed: "There are literally millions of people around the globe who could testify" that "the U.N. system is not incapable of bearing fruit." From this, Keyes draws out a theory of U.N. activity: "Mr. Chairman, the success stories of the U.N. system appear to have certain common features. Their aim has been to help people *not governments*. . . . They have concentrated on producing results, *rather than simply amassing or increasing inputs of resources*. By contrast, the exercises that have generally proven fruitless have been too ambitious in intention, too broad in scope. . . . They have been mainly informed by political imperatives rather than by a tangible sense of the daily needs of the people of developing countries."

The actual meaning of these sentences was not lost on representatives from the African nations. Just as charged, the U.N. has accomplished nothing as an international forum for shifting resources to the de-developed nations of Africa. Instead, while dribbling aid to starving populations, the U.N. supranational bureaucracy has actively worked to uphold the framework of the International Monetary Fund, whose genocidal conditionalities policies are the major source of social upheavals throughout the continent. The rule of the IMF and the price collapse of commodity exports in Africa have reduced the agricultural-production output levels of the black

African countries by 2% every year since 1970. For Keyes et al., however, these facts have nothing to do with the "realities of life for the people of developing countries."

Indeed, he goes a step further and demands the overthrow of any government that should stand in the way of such genocidal policies toward their populations. "We might begin to think less of increasing the power and resources of government and more about unleashing the energy and creativity of the people," says Keyes. "We might begin to accept the fact that government is not the only and, in most cases, not even the chief engine of development. In fact, *it is often an obstacle* [emphasis added]."

Given that Keyes has deleted "increasing inputs of resources" from his definition of development, Keyes proceeds to make clear what he might actually mean by the word: "With the people at the grass roots firmly in mind . . . take the problem of agricultural productivity and development, for example. One could argue, for instance, that it makes sense to have agricultural development as a priority for Africa, while industrialization might be the priority for another region."

Keyes is endorsing the policy enunciated in the World Bank report which criticizes infrastructural development as a "costly mistake" and declares that "industry becomes a burden on the more efficient and dynamic parts of the economy."

Of course, there can be no development of agriculture in Africa without the input of such resources as tractors and other machinery, electrification, and water management—all of them products of industrial development. This is all the more true in Africa, where the very lack of these resources has destroyed the land, created worsening drought conditions, and thrown millions of people into below-subsistence diet levels. Keyes's modest proposal is that this genocidal process be sped up.

On Nov. 2, the General Assembly will hold the first of six special sessions on Africa, to be chaired by Japan. No significant aid or solutions to the catastrophe facing the African nations can be expected to emerge. According to one advanced-sector diplomat involved in preparing for the session, the first objective is to learn what it is the African countries want. This means, he then elaborated, what the African countries want "within the framework of the IMF." The second objective is to "coordinate the many programs" that are already in existence—that is, exert increasing supranational control over the administration of IMF and U.N. programs within the countries, as also prescribed by the World Bank.

This agenda, in combination with the declaration of genocidal intent by Ambassador Keyes, is a firm warning to African countries that the United Nations forums are a rigged game, and function as diversions from the political combat *against* the IMF, the World Bank, and the powers behind Ambassador Keyes that is required for survival.