The British Empire Is Frantic To Eliminate Zimbabwe's Sovereignty

by Douglas DeGroot

The so-called British House of Lords debate on Zimbabwe, held on April 3, was an open declaration of war on the sovereignty of Zimbabwe, because of its years-long refusal to succumb to the Anglo-Dutch financial oligarchy's drive to expand their worldwide empire, under the rubric of globalization. It is noteworthy, that what the Lords and Ladies of the House of Lords said on April 3 (see below), began happening on the ground the following week.

Because their financial system has blown out, the British have no choice but to go all out, creating wars and destabilizations to destroy the sovereignty of nations, and turn them into passive looting grounds. Their situation has gotten so bad, that the International Monetary Fund is demanding that the British empire's banks, hopelessly bankrupt from unregulated speculation, be bailed out. The same IMF, using various pretexts of what it deemed unacceptable activities, has, since 2000, cut off Zimbabwe from any balance of payments assistance.

Lyndon LaRouche has pointed out that Zimbabwe is the tough nut the British have to crack, because of its will to fight globalization against what seem to be insurmountable odds. Once Zimbabwe is broken, they can move on to other countries in southern Africa, with South Africa being the next in line.

The IMF-imposed conditions of economic warfare against the country, stemming from an IMF deregulation and privatization program that was imposed in 1990, and the subsequent IMF-dictated credit cut-off, created enormous suffering for the population. It was under these conditions of demoralization and despair that the March 29 elections were held.

Zimbabwe won its independence in 1980, after a protracted fight, against the Southern Rhodesia government of Ian Smith. Southern Rhodesia had been a British colony. Then, in 1965, a Unilateral Declaration of Independence (UDI) provided the British with a pretext not to introduce majority rule in the colony.

After the independence struggle was finally won, the British colony became known as Zimbabwe. The new country became the envy of other Africa countries, who hoped to emulate it. After the new government invested in education and health care, it had the highest levels of skills and education in Africa.

The IMF Moves In

In 1990, Zimbabwe received an IMF Enhanced Structural Adjustment Facility (ESAF) loan. This loan had more conditions attached than normal IMF loans. Zimbabwe was forced to implement every radical IMF policy in the Fund's bag of tricks. To sharply reduce government spending, tens of thousands of workers were fired, the pay of those who remained was gutted, and the government drastically reduced spending on social programs. Taxes were reduced, and the country was opened up to foreign competition, which hit the manufacturing sector particularly hard.

The effects were disastrous. Employment and real wages fell. During the 1991-96 period of the IMF plan, manufacturing employment fell 9%, and wages dropped 26%, according to reports from the IMF itself. Public sector employment fell 23% and wages dropped 40%, while food prices soared by 36%. Meanwhile, the IMF plan did not deliver to the government what the IMF said it would, and the country was caught in a debt trap.

The first decade of improvements in health care, was reversed by the IMF plan. As a result, Zimbabwe now has one of the worst AIDS problems in the world.

For moving to protect the economy by stopping all privatization schemes, the IMF cut off all balance of payments assistance from 2000 on. Three reasons were given: 1) the defensive military intervention into the Democratic Republic of the Congo (the IMF said it wanted to stop this adventurism); 2) it didn't like the gratuities paid to war veterans (part of the Zanu-PF political machine); and 3) the land reform program.

These were all pretexts to make loan cutoffs that would wreck the country. On the same day that the IMF turned Zimbabwe down, over the issue that it had sent troops to defend the Democratic Republic of the Congo (D.R.C.), because they said Zimbabwe was too poor, it approved loans to Rwanda and Uganda. Both countries were poorer than Zimbabwe at that point, and both had troops in the D.R.C., who were the aggressors that Zimbabwe and other nations stopped from taking over the whole country.

The Lords and Ladies made no secret of the fact that they must break Zimbabwe, and turn it from a sovereign nation to a satrap. As you will see below, they are talking about getting rid of the government, and bringing the country back into their Commonwealth. The discussion was led by Lord Mark Mallock-Brown, who grew up in Southern Rhodesia, where his father was a diplomat. He is British Prime Minister Gordon Brown's Minister of State in the Foreign and

Commonwealth Office, with responsibility for Africa, Asia, and the United Nations. He was made a life peer on his elevation to Brown's cabinet. He specializes in changing leadership of countries in the globalized world, done under the guise of bringing democracy. Sometimes termed "Mighty Mouth" in Britain, he has also been labelled as part of the axis of George Soros, with whom he has worked as a destroyer of national sovereignty. He is also the controller of former UN Secretary General Kofi Annan, who recently negotiated a power-sharing agreement in Kenya, which has broken down again into violence. The Lords and Ladies think they can accomplish their takeover of Zimbabwe with power-sharing there.