
Why Are the British Planning More Wars?

British “technological apartheid” policy, not global warming, will cause more wars in Africa.

A study was released in the United States on Nov. 23, timed to intersect the Copenhagen climate conference, which purports to scientifically prove that civil wars will increase in Africa by 50% over the next two decades, because of a projected 1°C temperature increase by 2030.

This thesis is one that British publications, such as the City of London’s mouthpiece, *The Economist*, and the BBC, have been giving wide play. BBC published a release saying that research shows that “climate has been a major driver of armed conflict in Africa,” and that “future warming is likely to increase the number of deaths from war.”

The authors of this report, like the British monetarist empire, rule out water projects and other crucial infrastructural development projects. It is this rejection of development that will cause the wars that they are so smugly predicting.

By seeking to blame the horrific, worsening conditions in Africa on the “global warming” hoax, the British hope to create a seemingly “objective” factor to use as a smokescreen to hide the logical outcome of their anti-development policies for Africa, which are deliberately designed to limit population growth.

The report, “Warming Increases the Risk of Civil War in Africa,” was published in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. Researchers from Stanford University, the University of California-Berkeley, New York University, and Harvard contributed to the report.

Even on purely technical grounds, the study has no validity, since the authors acknowledge that the climate data that they ran through their computer models came from the now notorious and thoroughly discredited Climatic Research Unit (CRU) of the University of East Anglia in Britain. Its director, Phil Jones, was forced to step down after e-mails were “hacked” showing that the CRU was lying about global warming.

On the more important, methodological level, the report is also incompetent, since it ignores all political, social, and economic factors that create the conditions for conflict, such as IMF and World Bank anti-development interventions.

After IMF conditionalities and World Bank restructuring programs are implemented, which are designed to prevent an advanced development leading to higher levels of productivity, African countries are locked into traditional, less productive means of subsistence, and, hence, are much more susceptible to the effects of climatic changes.

About 40% of Africa’s more marginal land is used by semi-nomadic and nomadic herders. As long as African means of production have been forcibly retarded by lack of development, droughts will inevitably lead to competition for land and water between herders and farmers.

In eastern Africa, successive poor rainy seasons have decimated the farmers’ crops and herders’ livestock, leading, in the case of Kenya, to increasing conflicts over diminishing

water and pasture-land resources. While only 10% of the population in Kenya consists of herders, 90% of this segment is extremely poor, compared to the national average of 50%, according to UN statistics. So the susceptibilities to the vagaries of climate have been built into the present monetarist order, which the British adamantly refuse to change.

These conditions make it very easy to destabilize a country by manipulating conflicts. Kenyan Parliament member Mohamed Abdi Kuti said, according to a Nov. 27 *Los Angeles Times* article, that climatic conditions, such as drought, make the population more susceptible to political manipulation: “Because of the drought, people are desperate and they’re willing to do anything.”

Global warming advocates, such as Kenya’s Prof. Richard Odingo, claim that conflict over water in the dry region of northern Kenya could lead to a repeat there, of the Darfur conflict in neighboring Sudan, because of the danger of escalation of ongoing drought-fueled clashes between nomads and settled farmers. Odingo is the vice chairman of the the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), which was set up to propagate the idea fraud human activity is causing “global warming.”

The highly subjective study is built on projections of effects of temperature increase, estimates of historical response of conflict to climate in Africa, an assumption of a linear increase in temperature until 2030 and a 1°C temperature change. It rules out the effects that “any potentially offsetting effects of strong economic growth” could have, such as the revolution in policy proposed by Lyndon LaRouche to replace the IMF with a credit-based economic system, providing for directed investments in vital large infrastructure projects.