

Editorial

'Food Relief' Initiative Will Kill Nations

President Obama's April 2 announcement from the G-20 Summit in London, that the United States will double its spending for foreign food relief and farm aid, is hailed as a "new American initiative" against hunger. Obama said in London: "In the coming days, I intend to work with Congress to provide \$448 million in immediate assistance to vulnerable populations from Africa to Latin America, and to double support for food safety to over \$1 billion so that we are giving people the tools they need to lift themselves out of poverty." In itself, this commitment has merit and urgency: A billion people today lack enough to eat.

But in context, this pledge falls in step with the ongoing intention of the British Foreign Office, and its Millennium Development Goals (MDG) ploy, to mount pseudo-efforts to fight hunger, poverty, and disease, while destroying nations through enforced globalization, and obstructing the financial bankruptcy reorganization that could provide stability and credit for agro-industrial development and plentiful food.

These London MDG networks dovetail with a U.S. Senate bill, "The Global Food Security Act of 2009" (S. 384), co-sponsored by Richard Lugar (R-Ind.) and Robert P. Casey (D-Penn.), and passed March 31 by the Foreign Relations Committee. The bill is the culmination of a Project on Global Agriculture Development, funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation in September 2008; it was conducted out of the Chicago Council on Global Affairs. A parallel document was prepared by London's Royal Institute for International Affairs. The reports pay lip-service to science, food relief, and direct aid to "millions of small stakeholder farms" in Africa and Asia, while insisting on globalization.

In direct opposition to this imperial cant, the principle involved in assuring food sufficiency is

that farm productivity and security can only be accomplished *as part of programs to meet national requirements*. This, in turn, means building up infrastructure for water, power, sanitation, transportation, land use, and soil fertility. This is the story behind the successful Green Revolution in India (1967-78), and the lesson of the historical success of U.S. agriculture. This principle was behind the restoration of productive farming in post-World War II Europe, under the Common Agriculture Program. Infrastructure intervention improves the physical landscape, and upgrades social conditions as well.

In opposition to this nation-building approach, are the kinds of aid interventions insisted upon by the MDG operation, since it was launched by London and the George W. Bush Administration, and pushed by George Soros, British Foreign Office operative Lord Mark Malloch Brown, et al. The MDG campaign demands "single-shot" dogoodism in the name of reducing hunger, poverty, and disease—for example, micro-loans for "local business," anti-diarrhea medicines, individual solar water purifiers, improved seeds, biofuel projects, etc. In themselves, some of the mini-technologies may be just fine. But as *a policy*, this is deadly. Moreover, this MDG approach is being imposed as mandatory, under the threat of Al Gore's global warming hoax.

Especially insidious is the fact that, as nations have been undermined by globalization, resources have dried up for R&D conducted by national institutions. Instead, anti-nation operations, such as the Gates and Rockefeller Foundations, are dominating vital agriculture and medical research. The scientists employed may be dedicated and do fruitful work. But the policy will fail.

Either we act to restore nations, or we have genocide, with or without "aid."