

'The United Nations has lost its moral authority'

Dr. Kofi Awoonor is the ambassador and permanent representative of Ghana to the United Nations. In 1991 he was chairman of the Group of 77, which represents the more than 100 developing sector nations. A previous interview with Dr. Awoonor appeared in EIR on Nov. 1, 1991. The current interview was conducted in New York on June 17 by Dana S. Scanlon. It has been slightly shortened.

EIR: Prior to the U.N. Human Rights conference in Vienna, the nations of Africa, in the preparatory commissions, put forward a position, a continental-wide position, which took issue with what the non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and the U.S. were putting forward in the Atlanta resolution. In particular, Africa has stressed that economic development is a basic human right. Can you elaborate a little more on Africa's point of view for this conference?

Awoonor: If you remember, before the conference took place in Vienna, the various regional groupings were asked to make an input. And this input ended up in the Non-Aligned Movement, which had a committee in New York to draft a common position. And one of the elements, the most important element, of course, was our continuing definition of human rights as the right also to food, shelter, and social security. Because we don't see how anyone in their right mind can separate that from freedom from arrest, freedom of the press, freedom of association, and so on. We think that because of their Western liberal traditions, this has become a fixed idea for the so-called Western democracies.

You don't know what we are going through, in the developing countries, after suffering so many years of colonial exploitation. We did say that in the Non-Aligned Movement, we put in this particular viewpoint, and this viewpoint will not be negotiated away through any threats. And I must say,

Africa's position has been buttressed very strongly, since we are weakest link in the economic chain, by countries that are developing strong economies, countries in Asia in particular, by Malaysia, by Indonesia, and so on. These countries have seen a concerted attack, a conspiracy to undermine their own development efforts by a singularly austere focus on the liberal aspect of human rights.

Of course, the NGOs—we are a little worried sometimes about the NGOs. I had a lot of problems with the NGOs when I was chairing the G-77, on the environmental issue. I remember addressing the entire NGO group at one of the preparatory meetings in Geneva. And I said to them: "For God's sake, you cannot make environmental work part and parcel of some kind of almost dilettantish attachment to whales and elephants, and such wonderful species that we have here. Human beings are imperilled." Some of them seemed to understand it. But you see many of them are coming from this intellectual, emotional, psychological tradition of the West, which has perfected the habit of separating things.

EIR: Kenya has been one of the countries very much targeted by the human rights mafia, which the NGOs are very much a part of. The foreign minister of Kenya was in Washington a few weeks ago, and he made the point in response to a journalist complaining about the arrest of an editor, that the law on the books in Kenya allowing for the arrest and seizure of presses dates back to the British rule. He felt the law needed to be updated, but he made the point that many of the laws on the books that are now being decried as anti-democratic came from the British.

Awoonor: It's almost in the same frame when we see President De Klerk of South Africa being touted as a great democratic person. This is a man who has served at the helm of one

of the most repressive political machines, anywhere in the history of the world, based on the differentiations of skin color. When you read the *New York Times*, you would think there was no better man who ever walked this earth than Mr. De Klerk. And we are amazed at that kind of amnesia, or denial.

This becomes the basis for attacking countries like ours, where we don't even have water to drink, we don't even have food for our people, and so on. We are struggling 36 years into independence, to construct something. Thirty-six years is the blink of an eye in the life of a nation. And yet, we are under siege by those who have mandated the world for so long, saying, "You're not doing enough in human rights." And I say: Enable us to have more social security, and then you will see how well we will be doing in human rights.

EIR: What is your assessment so far of what has been happening in Vienna?

Awoonor: From afar, I get the IPS news reports, which seem to be an attempt at balanced reportage, so I don't rely on the *New York Times*—I read the *New York Times* for what it is worth. Yes, there is a clash of ideas, I think it's good. I have kept on saying all the time that my function as a representative of Ghana at the U.N., and I hoped this would be the function of many of my colleagues, is that we must state our side of the case loud and clear, without any fear. As so I think that in Vienna these countries that are part of the kind of perspective that I've just mentioned have been very clear.

Of course, if you look at it from the Western liberal point of view, you may think that many of them have their own private agenda, because of certain internal problems that they have. But they did say yesterday very clearly, and I was so pleased to see that, and CNN had the moral courage to put it on: "Tell us which country has no human rights violations, and we will be showing you the kingdom of God." And they pointed to the United States: What have you done about the American Indians, what about your inner cities, what about the poor, what about those who are racial minorities? Are you addressing that, or are you coming to preach at us? So let's all agree that we all have problems, and see that those problems all have certain compelling economic bases.

The human rights violations in this country have a lot to do with the poverty: The poor have no justice, the poor have no housing, the poor have no health, the poor are the first to be arrested, they are the first to die in jail. If that doesn't concern human rights, we don't know what does.

EIR: There is a big push, which was endorsed by U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher, for the creation of a U.N. High Commissioner on Human Rights. What is Ghana's view on that, and more broadly, what is the Non-Aligned view?

Awoonor: We think that idea is a non-starter. We don't think that idea will fly through the General Assembly. The position we are going to take on this, is that we have nothing



Dr. Kofi Nyidevu Awoonor told the NGOs in Geneva: "For God's sake, you cannot make environmental work part and parcel of some kind of almost dilettantish attachment to whales and elephants. Human beings are imperilled."

against any efforts to construct human rights anywhere in the world, and if the U.N. wants to have someone who sort of listens in, fine. But we are not going to have a kind of a supreme commander of human rights, who will be given all kinds of powers to list violators, and therefore preparing those so-called violators for trial. And as one of the delegates to the human rights conference in Vienna said, we will not accept a regime of prosecutors, judges, and executioners all rolled into one.

EIR: And accountable to whom?

Awoonor: Exactly. It is an idea which has been floating around for some time. We will have to debate it properly.

EIR: So you think that if the proposal came to the floor of the General Assembly, it wouldn't go through?

Awoonor: It would have to come to the General Assembly, and it wouldn't fly.

Many of our countries are looking at human rights issues, but looking at them in this broader framework. We would definitely be foolish if we would deny that people are not being victimized because of a brutal police force, because the judicial system is incompetent and therefore venal in many ways, it oppresses people. If you don't address those questions, you will not be addressing any question at all. But that is subsumed by the larger question of what access people

It is simply wrong to see human beings in terms of dollars and cents, and whether the books are balanced. Budget deficits are eliminated at the cost of human life. That is what they want us to do! And we are saying we can't do it. These are our people.

have to issues of justice.

EIR: It also seems that since the official policies of the United Nations bureaucracy and many of these agencies, the U.N. Population Fund and so forth, are against population growth, are against the proliferation of life, and therefore to have these same agencies decrying constitutional violations in this or that country, when they themselves do not recognize life to be a primary human right—

Awoonor: Constructed into the entire debate, if you call it that, is the Darwinian concept. Those who are the fittest are the only ones fit to live on this planet. If you are weak, hard luck. We're sorry you are poor, we're sorry you can't make it. This is what has been demonstrated during the last 12 years of both Reagan and Mrs. Thatcher in London, the two poles of the global axis of power. And they did it brilliantly. But what was the price you have to pay for it in this country? What is the price those in England have to pay for it now?

It is simply wrong to see human beings in terms of dollars and cents, and whether the books are balanced. Budget deficits are eliminated at the cost of human life. The hospitals are closed. There is no medical delivery system anymore. The ambulances cannot drive the streets. That is what they want us to do!

And we are saying we can't do it. These are our people; we are only their spokespersons.

I come from one generation removed from a peasant origin. My mother never went to school. And I go to the village. I am in the village, that's where I spend my time. I can't go into that village when they have no water, when they have no school, and when they have no health delivery system, and you're asking me to tell them about freedom of the press! Which press? Freedom of assembly? They're assembling already.

The value of life, you've correctly said it, is the center core of the denial in Western cultural concepts. And it didn't start today.

EIR: The Bosnia conflict has been on the forefront of the agenda at the U.N., in words anyway, for quite some time. What is your evaluation of how the Bosnian situation has been allowed to degenerate to the point that we have seen over the months: the rape camps, the slaughter, the ethnic cleansing? What about the U.N. and also U.S. involvement in this process?

Awoonor: Bosnia came along as part of the changes in the geopolitical situation after the collapse of the Soviet Union and the eastern European communist states, and the emergence of new nationalisms all over the place. The pity about Yugoslavia, is that the nationalism that they're talking about there has infused into it a religious factor. It's the first time that as an equation, whether you're dealing with Serbs or Croats, you're also going to be dealing with Muslims and Christians. I don't know the demography, but I'm sure there are Serbs who are Muslims, or Croats who are Muslims, I don't know how they are able to sort that out.

So going back to your question, at the onset of this chaos in that part of the world, the U.N. in its eternal confusion in the post-Soviet era, simply said: "Oh, this is a European problem, so we hand it over to the Europeans and NATO, and NATO with its military and political component should address this question, and make sure you talk to the Russians also because the Russians share a corridor, they are there." And you know what happened: The meeting that was brokered in London sometime last year, the meeting that was held in Geneva, and so on, we've seen the movement backwards and forwards.

Meanwhile, as this is going on, the carnage escalates from day to day. And the U.N. comes back and says, "We have to do something about it." We have people in there who are playing a lot of chess games, and saying: "It has a lot to do with the question of Europe itself not discharging its responsibility."

If you remember, Mr. Clinton said, and he kept on saying it even until last week: We couldn't go into Europe because the Europeans didn't want us to do it. But now they are planning to take 800 troops into Macedonia. Why Macedonia? Because the idea is that when you put those troops in Macedonia, it sends a message that this conflict, that the carnage should not expand downstairs into almost the near Mediterranean zone of Macedonia. . . .

But the footdragging by the U.S. administration as a major power in the U.N. is alibied by the proposition that this is a European affair, that we can't get involved.

But the Muslim factor has to be assessed. Europe is petrified of Islam. There is almost an atavistic fear which is coming out of the wellsprings of medieval thinking, that we will have another Crusade era on our hands. The fundamentalists are here. The demonization of the Ayatollah [Khomeini] has a lot to do with it. And we're coming back to that, after

the breakup of the Soviet Union. Many, many countries or republics in that former country have become Muslim states: Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and so on. They are all Muslim states, and they are being pulled together, in the European assessment, into some kind of a pan-Islamic fundamentalist conspiracy. And the Bosnians are a little piece in that chess game.

So if you can contain, or if you empower the Serbians by sheer indifference to do what they're doing, you're solving a lot of problems. You're removing at least one leg or one wing of the emerging Islamic monster.

One of your senators put it very well. Joe Biden, whom I don't agree with all the time, said in one of the most vehement statements I've ever heard any American senator make, on any issue outside of this country: If it was the other way around—that is, if the Serbians were the ones being slaughtered by Muslims—you can be sure the Americans would be there. The helicopters that are now shooting women and children in Mogadishu would have been operating in Europe long ago. Because we have the Gulf war to prove that.

Here we are: Bosnia-Herzegovina is supposed to be a U.N. problem, but I can tell you, the U.N. hasn't got any clue as to how to solve it. It has troops on the ground. These troops are coming from many, many of the European nations, but they do not take instructions from any organized U.N. command system. Just as the situation is unfolding in Mogadishu: You have a U.N. presence, but it is dominated by a particular country.

The Europeans dominate the Bosnian situation, and they will play it according to their own agenda.

EIR: And the Russian role?

Awoonor: The Russian role is equally part of that sinister role. The Russians are afraid of the underbelly of Islamic fundamentalism in the republics around them, which goes all the way into the Asian border. The Russians, because of their own domestic problems, are completely incapable of any clear project vis-à-vis Bosnia. You listen to the foreign minister or even Boris Yeltsin, if he is able to articulate anything at all at any time; they come around and they say, "We're living close to this problem, so we have a right to say what should be done." And there's nothing that they're doing—just watching it, like the Europeans.

I'm also suspicious of the fact that the recent American embrace of Russia, in financial terms, could be a scenario, an action that is designed to keep Russia very much in tow vis-à-vis what the United States and its European allies want to hear.

EIR: As far as Somalia is concerned, there seem to be two standards, where the U.S. fully capable of deploying the armed might of what remains the world's greatest industrial power to fight a "warlord" in Somalia, and yet stands impotently by on the Bosnia side. What do you see as the U.S. role in Somalia presently?

Awoonor: I gave an interview to BBC yesterday, and I talked to a few of my friends before I gave this interview, because I wanted to know what the other African delegations were thinking. Many of them agreed with my position. Somalia is virtually a leftover of a Reagan-Bush agenda—an agenda which echoes what had taken place in Grenada, in a miserable little country around the corner here, [and] Panama, where they captured somebody to put him on trial and put him in jail, and in the Panama case, that man was created by them! So, yes indeed, Somalia did collapse; after the flight of Siad Barre, that country was going to pieces.

It was very praiseworthy; at least the humanitarian work that was done by the United Task Force, spearheaded by the United States, was very, very good work. We had to go in there and give them food, give them milk, silence some of the guns of the warlords, create corridors to go in. Even though some of us, including myself, when we were debating the humanitarian relief coordination work of the U.N., we said: "We cannot deliver charity at the point of a gun." The situation that was created in Somalia with the collapse of any semblance of authority whatsoever, necessitated that action of the United Task Force. Then I said again, that after you've done that work, to give them food, to make them survive, it is unthinkable to go in there and slaughter them. It's almost an echo of some kind of a viewpoint that I've seen or heard before in a nightmare: In order to save a village, we destroy it.

There must be some kind of a link between the first action of the United Task Force, which would tell them—some kind of a message that what they are doing now is morally reprehensible.

But having said that, let me add that there are leftovers from the [U.S.] State Department and from the military; many, many retired army generals and colonels are in Somalia. I have had that confirmed this morning. I have called the U.N. people and asked them to tell me what is the structure on the ground, because we don't know; you tell us that the U.S. has a thousand people in there. . . .

You see, one of the tricks that is being played now, is that for all humanitarian, and civilian, and other peacekeeping operations, they want to create a huge component of civilian advisers, and Somalia is the experiment ground. So the lady who was in Iraq, April Glaspie—the [U.S.] ambassador in Iraq who told Saddam Hussein that there would be no problems if he launched a war—is in Somalia. Apart from her, there is [retired U.S. Navy Adm. Jonathan T.] Howe [the chief U.N. envoy in Somalia], and quite a lot of these political people who were part of the Reagan-Bush system, and they are there.

And they were charged, according to the U.N., with setting up a police administration, a judicial system, and so on, to create a civilian authority in Somalia. And I was told by someone from the U.N. that they were going around arresting bandits and locking them up, in all kinds of places. And then you find the so-called bandits have been shot trying to escape. There are no courts; they are keeping them, pend-



Somali children in the town of Belot Huen await food distribution from Operation Provide Comfort in August 1992. But now almost a year later, they're being slaughtered. "It's almost an echo of some kind of a viewpoint that I've seen or heard before in a nightmare: In order to save a village, we destroy it."

ing the setting up of courts. The logic of that is what is being enacted in front of our eyes. That they must get Aided for trial. Resolution 837 from the Security Council on June 6, after the killing of the Pakistani troops, virtually established that, which is totally in contradiction with the earlier perspective which led to the United Task Force humanitarian work on the ground.

EIR: Do you have any information on what Glaspie's position is there?

Awoonor: I think she's one of the number-two people to Admiral Howe. So she's in a very engaged advisory position. [Former ambassador Robert] Oakley is there; many, many of them are there.

And we also hear that some of the people that are about to be gotten rid of by Clinton, from the State Department, are being funneled into the Somalia operation.

EIR: Kenya is a neighbor of Somalia, and in much the same way that Siad Barre was targeted a few years ago for human rights violations, for being a dictator, and a lot of money flowed into the opposition to topple him, and the opposition was very much based on the tribal component; there was no unified opposition with a plan to run the country. Kenya is being targeted in very much the same way, and you see the opposition there also has degenerated into tribal groups. Isn't there a danger of the Somaliazation of

Kenya or other countries?

Awoonor: Yes, in other parts of the continent, in particular in East Africa. Except that the scenario in Kenya is slightly different historically. One has to deal with the background before one can assess what is going to be happening on the ground. If you remember, Somalia was used as part of the chessboard against President Mengistu in Ethiopia.

Having said that, it is true, Kenya has always been a U.S. or Western ally, one of the darlings of the Western world, since British days, and later after independence, when Kenyatta made his peace with Britain. The most corrupt network of economic relationships anywhere on the continent could be found in Kenya—barring other places closer to home, in my home region. So, having said that, Arap Moi, who emerged after Kenyatta's death, came from a very small tribe, and the Kikuyu, which are the majority tribe, see power as their preserve. They must run that country. This problem multiplies itself across the continent. And the Western powers know, because they've always played this game of tribes. This has been the perfect recipe for the entire imperial and colonial agenda: You pit tribe against tribe. But it has to be a tribe that you can use by its numerical strength, the way the Hausas were used in Nigeria, the Kikuyus are playing a role now in Kenya. So the opposition, as you correctly said, has been fragmented into tribal groups, because the Kikuyus want power.

I think the level of development in Kenya is much higher than that of Somalia. Kenya has had a more stable economy, a more sustained level of development, comparatively, than Somalia has enjoyed. We think that because of that, it will cushion Kenya against a similar fate of Somalia. So we come to our economic arguments again; where people have a certain level of development, a total collapse is less immediately possible, unless you are talking about a full blown war.

If you remember Biafra, Nigeria could sustain that, because there is a level development, both human and physical development, that could take that shock and survive it. But Somalia, like a few other countries, does not have that level of development. So we're hoping that that itself shields it against chaos.

Also let me add: Kenya, unlike Somalia, has enjoyed a very steady middle class. No country can expand if it doesn't expand that middle-class community. And this middle class cuts across various tribes. We hope that because of that, they will have the sense to know that they cannot be used to destroy their own country.

One of the things that I said to the panelists on the BBC broadcast yesterday, when they were defending General Aided to me, that they don't know why the world is after him, I said: Let's face it, he is a thug, and no thug, whether African or anywhere else, could be defended for the things that they do. You go and put heavy guns and you destroy your own country, of course you invite action from outside.

Not that we justify or we defend the external action; but look at what you did that led to that action, and I hope that Kenyans will have enough sense not to fall into whatever trap anyone has laid for them.

EIR: Sudan is clearly one of the countries in Africa that is being demonized around the world, like Ayatollah Khomeini. And there is talk of the U.N. intervening in the South. What is your assessment of the Sudanese situation?

Awoonor: Let me begin with the fact that there has been a process of dialogue going on over the past few months, brokered by the Organization of African Unity (OAU), in Abuja, Nigeria. It has not made much headway. I think that a review of that process will be made come the next summit in Cairo at the end of this month of June. Having said that, the Sudanese situation is very much part of what I said, the anti-Islamic onslaught which is coming from what I would call the Christian democracies of the world, who see Islam or a resurgent Islamic fundamentalism in the world as the enemy.

I am hopeful that the Sudanese will have the good sense to resolve that problem themselves, particularly the most sticky problem in the internal squabble, around the Sharia, the use of the Sharia as a constitutional instrument, where Khartoum would want to impose Islamic law on the whole country—Sharia laws. Whether you are a Christian, or a non-Christian, or you worship your grandfather's ancestral stool,

you're going to be subject to Sharia law, and we think that this is an outrage. Because religion should be as free and unfettered for anyone in any country. But where these fundamentalists are talking about God being the head of state, in a theocratic structure, then they're going to be imposing, like the Ayatollah in Iran, these Islamic laws on the people who are not Islamic.

The OAU itself has enough pressure; this is why Ghana and others are very important. When Col. John Garang [head of the Southern rebel Sudanese People's Liberation Army] comes to visit us, he comes to solicit our support for this. We have Muslims in Ghana. We have 28% Muslim, 30-32% Christians, and then rest are you name it. And we want that pluralism to be considered as the most sane way for the Sudan to proceed.

This was all begun by Nimeiri, who was created by the United States [In September 1983, President Gaafar Mohamed Nimeiri's government first decreed that Islamic law, Sharia, would be strictly enforced throughout the country—ed.] And [Nimeiri's successor] President Bashir and others are in the pocket of the rich fundamentalist states, particularly of Iran, and we also hear he is getting support from Iraq. And for him to sound as though he is now the flaming sword of Allah, he must defend this outrage.

We don't like the manner in which the West wants to enter into that fray, through the use of the United Nations.



Why U.N. plans for world government must be stopped

a new special report from *Executive Intelligence Review*

\$250

with authoritative case studies of
**Iraq, Cambodia, El Salvador, Somalia,
and the former Yugoslavia**

- 240 pages
- maps
- charts
- illustrations

Make checks payable to:

EIR News Service, Inc.

P.O. Box 17390 Washington, D.C. 20041-0390

Lyndon LaRouche replies on derivatives bubble

Economist and political prisoner Lyndon LaRouche, when asked to comment on Dr. Awoonor's remarks on the doubtful value of placing a tax on all financial derivatives transactions, issued the following message on June 24 to the ambassador and those reading over his shoulder.

First of all, our purpose in this is not to simply put a surtax, so to speak, on this; but first of all, to bring it under control for a number of purposes. My long-range intent would be to tax it into extinction, or bring it to extinction by other means. But the intervening problem is that when this system collapses, as it will in any case, the derivative system, which is sucking the blood out of the world, will bring down the banking system potentially.

We need to bring this under control, because it is not under control, in the sense of being able to map what its impact on the collapse will be, so that we can draft suitable

banking reorganization measures to keep the banking structure we need in place—despite the collapse of the banking system because of its involvement, particularly the U.S. banking system, in generating this derivatives bubble.

As for the general policy, which I have toiled with, I think he would find interesting the introduction I was asked to contribute to a pamphlet on this [to be published soon by *New Federalist* newspaper]. I think he should receive a copy, and he would see what our state of mind is.

Otherwise, I would say in addition to that, that I concur that the dangers which he cites are precisely the dangers which would arise if the intent was to simply put a surtax on it. But the tax serves the purpose not merely of a stable source of tax revenue, but as an interim measure in a process of bringing this bubble under the control, and also for the purpose of being able to control the collapse when it occurs, as it must, very soon, in order to permit the relevant institutions of government to prepare for the collapse and to structure emergency legislation to maintain the continuity of production and trade in face of such a collapse.

Yes, indeed, if there is humanitarian work to be done, let us go and do it. But as we always say, humanitarian work or situations that lead to the need to do humanitarian work, must have fundamental causes, so you must go in and find out why. And that is a pacific process, where you've got to sit down and talk to people and find out what they think; you don't go in there with helicopters and gunships.

EIR: What is in the interest of the Sudanese?

Awoonor: Have a national reconciliation, and draw up a constitution that accepts religious pluralism, and which rejects the imposition of the religious views of one, i.e., the Sharia laws in Islam, as the law for the entire country. If they want to replicate Iran in Sudan, they cannot do it, because a good chunk of the Sudan is non-Islamic. It's like trying to do the same thing in Nigeria, or in Ghana for that matter. There's no way you can get away with that. It's a recipe for conflict. The Sudanese themselves must understand that—unless they're not reading their own situation the way we, who are not even privy to be part of it, are reading it from a distance.

EIR: Can you fill us in on the immediate situation in Haiti?

Awoonor: Yes, a resolution has been passed by the Security Council imposing primarily an oil blockage on Haiti, giving them seven days to reinstall Jean-Bertrand Aristide as President. This can be explained by the fact that, after the seven days, when Haiti does not conform, the Canadians offered, when [Prime Minister Brian] Mulroney came to visit with Mr. Clinton, to use the Canadian Navy to blockade Haiti.

After the prime minister, Marc Bazin, resigned, we thought the gate was opened a little bit for the secretary general's envoy, Dante Caputo, and the OAS [Organization of American States], which seems always to be under the baton of the United States, to go in and begin some kind of a discourse. The Caribbean countries were taking a very good, a very strong position, that we need to have dialogue. But what is Caricom [Caribbean Common Market] compared to the OAS, which is funded by the United States? So the OAS position has carried the weight in the Security Council. The countries that are there in the Security Council, that should be able to help them to construct an intelligent alternative to what they are going to be doing now, are not going to talk.

EIR: Now that we've had this overview of all the problems in the world, maybe we could try to conclude by looking at some of the prospects for solutions. One of the things we've been looking into at *EIR* is the growth of the so-called derivatives market, which is a purely speculative bubble—it's not trading in stocks and bonds, it's trading in options on options; it is so far removed from the real economy, but trillions of dollars are siphoned into this market. Surely those funds could be put to better use. And Lyndon LaRouche, *EIR*'s founding editor, has proposed a tax on this derivatives market, at each point of sale, of one-tenth of one percent on the notional value. This, of course, could generate some of the revenues to deal with budget deficit problems; but the idea would be to begin to curb the growth, the frenzy, of this completely speculative market. What are your thoughts on this?

Awoonor: I think it was Edward Heath who once, looking at Tiny Rowland—you remember Tiny Rowland?

EIR: We wrote the book on Tiny Rowland!

Awoonor: I just read the book [*Tiny Rowland: The Ugly Face of Neocolonialism in Africa*, Washington, D.C.: Executive Intelligence Review, 1993]. A brilliant little book. I enjoyed it immensely. Looking at Tiny Rowland, he said, "That is the ugly face of capitalism."

You use the term "speculation." What you should add is that by the sheer process of speculation, there is also the gigantic factor of manipulation. Because you are manipulating the market. And that manipulation of the market—and I am here talking from my vantage point as somebody in the developing world, we are dealing also in that market with raw, primary products, like coffee or cocoa. My feeling is that we are the direct victims; this manipulative structure is really aimed at us. Because there is no way that we can win in this game of the stock markets of the world. So even if you go in, and accept Mr. LaRouche's proposal, apart from the hope that it would control and eventually curtail it—in that tax structure, those who are the beneficiaries of this manipulation will still have a comparative advantage. They will still know how to manipulate the market further in order to maximize their profits, also in order to afford the payment of the tax.

You see, if you impose a tax on, say, petroleum, what will happen immediately is that the distributors and the owners of the petroleum industry will say, "Fine, we'll pass it on to the consumer." The consumer will end up being the one paying that tax. The profiteers will not pay—they never pay. And this is what I think would be the difficulty in the tax concept.

We had hoped that the United Nations, through some of its powers as a factor in development—that is why it set up, years ago, the UNCTAD [U.N. Commission on Trade and Development]—that it would have a regime to which all of us, traders and buyers, dealers in whatever, would be part of, some kind of a common assembly where we would have certain basic ground rules.

But you see, the U.N. has lost its moral authority, even in as simple a thing as peacekeeping. How is it going to be telling the world to organize the global economy, on a more equitable basis, when it doesn't even want to accept the principle that the Bretton Woods institutions, set up after the war, are designed to perpetuate this same structure of usury and profiteering, that is part and parcel of the IMF [International Monetary Fund], the World Bank, and GATT [General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade]? GATT is a place where things are confiscated from us, and paltry pennies given in return. And the big ones are the ones who uphold the game of GATT. . .

Flowing out of that is the pernicious fact that food is a weapon. It is a tool. Food aid has been one of the tools, that has been used consistently to destroy many, many small countries. We had a debate a couple of years ago in Ghana about this, about food aid and its dangers. The Americans

were outraged!

I was very optimistic when this country elected Mr. Clinton. I gave a keynote address at the African Students Association in Seattle last November. And I say, it looks like a new day is dawning, a new perspective, a framework of morality in international relations. I haven't given up yet. He's floundering; he sounds sometimes as though he doesn't know what is happening. One of the most dangerous people he appointed to his cabinet, is Warren Christopher. I don't know how he did it, but I hear it was Jimmy Carter who persuaded him to appoint Warren Christopher—who came from a segment of American foreign policy which was no different from what the Reagan and Bush administrations were doing. And he was even involved, from what I heard, in the aftermath of the hostage crisis in Iran, the thing that actually derailed Carter's presidency; and he's the one being recycled now into foreign policy.

I don't know what the Americans are doing with GATT. There is a big quarrel going on. Leon Britton came down here. Two days ago, it was announced that there is an impasse on the agricultural subsidy issue. And the interesting thing is that the impasse is simply because the powers are using agricultural produce as an instrument of foreign policy. Yet, we are told by the World Bank and the IMF that we cannot have subsidies of fertilizers for our farmers, we cannot have subsidies of seed for our farmers, we cannot invest in infrastructure, to give water to the fields so that farmers can produce for self-sufficiency.

I keep on telling my people in Ghana, we have to work out a new direction. It's going to be hard, it's going to be tough. But until we do that, there is no way we can be truly independent. But you see, the glory would be if we can work in tandem with our African neighbors. We have 16 countries in West Africa, in Ecowas, almost 200 million people. We have a lot of water in that area.

You must come to Ghana and see the Lake Volta, in the middle of the country: It's 500 kilometers of lake, fresh water, sitting in the middle of the country. And it's not being used; we produce nothing with it. Five hundred kilometers of fresh water.

So we have to do our work. We cannot be mooning and weeping all the time because these people are doing what they're doing. What about ourselves? Are we so stupid?

So let's get ourselves together and see what we can do with good-willed people from abroad who understand—people like you, who are reading through it, because you came from here, and you could see the other side also in even sharper focus than many of us can see because we are so close to it.

This is why I enjoy reading the *EIR*. I read it religiously. I don't agree with everything you say all the time. We send it to our Foreign Ministry, we tell our people to read it, and they read it. It gives us a window into things which we ourselves have been feeling instinctively, but you articulate it very well. You construct the debate for us.