Africa Gets Attention, But Policy Criticized

By Joe Davidson

Despite the continuing controversy surrounding the lingering war in Iraq, President Bush's activity on Africa, often a forgotten continent, commanded attention throughout the summer.

Although his five-day, five nation Africa trip in July was criticized by many as symbolic of a policy long on rhetoric and short on action, it nonetheless concentrated interest on humankind's homeland to a degree that only a presidential trip can.

President Bush used his visit to Senegal, South Africa, Botswana, Uganda and Nigeria to promote his proposed funding increases for foreign assistance and HIV/AIDS programs. Yet his next year's budget actually calls for significant cuts in African aid. Equally worrisome, his decision to commit U.S. military peacekeeping troops to Liberia was marked by dither and delay.

Facing strong pressure to act on Liberia from home and abroad — including pleas from both sides in the country's vicious civil war — Bush procrastinated for weeks before dispatching three war ships to anchor off the nation's coast.

—Continued on page 10
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Africa: Promises Are Good, Action is Better

President Bush pleasantly surprised many when he announced a $15 billion global initiative on HIV/AIDS and a significant increase in foreign assistance through his proposed Millennium Challenge Account. And by visiting the continent relatively early in his term, he put Africa on the political agenda in a way only a presidential trip can do.

This special issue of FOCUS on Africa examines U.S. policy toward the continent. Andrew Young, a former United Nations ambassador and long-time Africa advocate, says that given the low expectations when the administration took over, Bush’s approach to the continent is “very significant.”

But the question is, compared to what? Bush told the National Urban League convention this year that the United States is the most generous country when it comes to helping the poor and hungry around the world. It’s true that Washington spends more on foreign assistance than other donor nations do. But as our cover story reports, U.S. foreign aid, as a percentage of “national income,” ranks at the bottom of donor nations, according to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. And the administration’s delay in responding to the crisis in Liberia is another example of Washington action falling behind rhetoric when it comes to Africa.

Furthermore, Bush’s budget for the next fiscal year proposes cutting assistance to Africa, even as total U.S. worldwide assistance would increase. Foreign aid, of course, is not the sole answer to Africa’s problems. Ultimately, those problems will be solved from within, with competent, well-targeted help from abroad. A big part of the solution will be increasing Africa’s self-sufficiency through enhancing its commerce, its exports and its trading capacity. The Joint Center is helping with that part of the solution through A Ten-Year Strategy for Increasing Capital Flows to Africa, which we co-sponsored along with the Institute for International Economics, the Corporate Council on Africa and the Council on Foreign Relations.

The strategy was developed by the Commission on Capital Flows to Africa, which spent a year studying how to attract sustainable capital investment in the continent. Though one in eight of the world’s people lives there, Africa accounts for less than 1 percent of the world’s trade, and more than half of its people live in dire poverty.

Yet it might be surprising for some to learn, as the Commission notes in our Economic Report, that the United States today exports much more to Africa than it does to all of the former Soviet states, including Russia, combined.

Africa has long been an important part of the Joint Center. We’ve been working there for almost two decades, on projects dealing with democracy and governance, women’s empowerment and local leadership development. Our Johannesburg, South Africa, office, which opened 11 years ago, now manages economic policy research programs on how HIV/AIDS can affect small and medium size businesses, the socio-economic status of households and communities, and low-income housing.

Our involvement with HIV/AIDS teaches us that no issue is more critical to the health and development of Africa. And because of that, President Bush’s HIV/AIDS initiative certainly is welcome. But so far, the HIV/AIDS initiative, as well as the Challenge Account, are plans with no money. Our concern for the continent also means we are concerned that current African programs will face budget cuts.

Big plans and presidential visits are good. Action, funded with more generous American contributions, is even better.
Andrew Young Calls Bush’s Africa Policy “Very Significant”

President Bush, several African heads of state and government, as well as delegates from the United States and Africa attended the Sixth Leon H. Sullivan Summit, which was held in July in Abuja, Nigeria. Formerly known as The African African-American Summit, it was renamed for its founder after his death two years ago. Andrew Young, a former United Nations ambassador, congressman and mayor of Atlanta, was chairman of this year’s Summit. He spoke with FOCUS editor Joe Davidson in Abuja. This is an edited version of the interview.

FOCUS: How do you characterize the importance of the Summit?

Young: I think we’ve all become aware of the fact that for our free enterprise system to work we almost need a global economy. We’re at a time when the whole world is in a borderline recession because there is no growth. It’s plain to me that the area of growth that can help to create the kind of economic boom that’s needed around the world is getting Africa more involved in the global economy. So I see, and I think Dr. Sullivan saw, Africa and African Americans as linked together. And he always talked about slavery and some good having to come out of the suffering. Dr. [Martin Luther] King used to talk about the same kind of thing — that unearned suffering is redemptive.

FOCUS: The beginning of the Summit occurred earlier than originally planned. That allowed President Bush to address the Summit. How would you characterize U.S. policy toward Africa under President Bush?

Young: Amazingly, it’s been very significant. I think [former President] Clinton put a lot of pressure on this country [Nigeria] for human rights. But Bush has been economically more involved. There has been more money coming toward Africa. He came to Africa earlier in his term. He’s got a couple of more years. Both Clinton and [former President] Carter came toward the end of their terms. So by coming early, I feel rather optimistic. Also, we had the bipartisan Africa Growth and Opportunity Act [AGOA, which was passed under Clinton], and we have seen increases in the volume of trade between Africa and the U.S. And I think it’s now about $29 billion annually. That’s pretty significant. We’ve seen Africa also become more strategically important because of the confusion in the Middle East. African oil, and its development, is an absolute necessity.

FOCUS: Why did you say “amazingly” before characterizing Bush’s policy toward Africa?

Young: Because first of all, in his campaign he said that he couldn’t see any importance in Africa. Even Condoleezza Rice and Colin Powell had no particular background or personal connections in Africa. The truth of it is, I have probably been more involved in conversations [with administration officials] about Africa policy during the first two years of the Bush administration than I was the whole eight years with Clinton.

FOCUS: The Congressional Research Service recently issued reports that said overall foreign aid in the proposed FY2004 budget would increase by 13 percent, while total aid to Africa would actually decrease by 7 percent. So, assuming that the CRS analysis is correct…

Young: I have not read that analysis. I want to see where this money is going. And I have heard about this $15 billion [proposed to fight HIV/AIDS]. But I don’t know who is spending it where. The AGOA, the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act — I have seen the results of that in terms of increased manufacturing and opportunities around Southern Africa. All of this is a drop in the bucket. … But I am just glad to see that this much has happened. We’ve got something to work with.

My one aim for this term was that America understand the strategic importance of Africa to America. That means we’re not involved for humanitarian reasons, for human rights and soft stuff. It means that we understand that our survival can depend on Africa. It happens in strange ways. [Vice President Dick] Cheney was with Halliburton. You can’t run an oil well without doing something with Halliburton. Halliburton is involved in Angola and Congo (Kinshasa) and Congo-
Brazzaville, Guinea-Bissau, Equatorial Guinea. They are all over.

People are cynical about oil politics. But the truth of it is, we can’t get along without it. We’ve been getting oil and giving very little for it. I think Africa is important not only for its minerals and raw materials like oil, diamonds and gold. Africa is an important potential market. It’s also going to be an important potential human resource.

**FOCUS: What is the importance of Africa to state legislators, mayors, city council members — the kinds of people that the Joint Center serves?**

**Young:** Africa is a difficult challenge for elected officials unless they really know something about Africa. Is Ireland important to Irish? Is Italy important to Italian elected officials? Is Israel important to Jewish elected officials? Why should the Black elected be the only one with no roots and no heritage? So I think it is incumbent upon us to learn something of Africa.

**FOCUS: But does it go beyond heritage?**

**Young:** It goes beyond heritage. But it has to start with heritage, I think. Because unlike Ireland, and Italy and Israel, Africa is enormously more complicated. … What I would like to see is a development of partnerships between different parts of Africa and specific cities in the United States. I often get credit for being related to Africa, but the truth of it is that Decatur, Georgia, had a better relationship to Berkina Faso than Atlanta had to any place in Africa. They sent agricultural economists from the University of Georgia to Berkina Faso. They had exchange students. They now have in Decatur, an Olympic-training center bringing in athletes from all over the world. And it’s a little, insignificant city. But it was interesting. It was easier for a White boy from Mississippi (the mayor) to promote Africa than it was for me, a Black ambassador. If I had promoted Africa, they would have accused me of being partial to Africa for emotional reasons. This White boy from Mississippi actually had a degree in African American studies from the University of Mississippi and had spent time in the Peace Corps. And he mobilized his city to serve the needs of Africa.

**FOCUS: When you talk about partnerships, are you talking about business partnerships?**

**Young:** I am talking about first of all knowing people. … You don’t do business with countries. You do business with friends. And when somebody has lived in your house and studied at your school for two or three years, you know that that is somebody that you can trust with your business investments. But just to come over here for one visit and try to make a business partnership, you’re sure not only to lose money but you might end up in jail.

Our relationship to Africa ultimately will be an economic relationship. But you can’t start there. You’ve got to start with friendship, education, faith and trust. That’s why I am promoting the work of our churches in Africa. Our churches have done a lot through the years. There wouldn’t be a Nelson Mandela or Desmond Tutu if it weren’t for some missionaries. There were not just White missionaries in Africa 100 years ago. There were Black missionaries in Africa.

**FOCUS: One last question. This year marks the 40th Anniversary of the 1963 March on Washington. Right now we are at the Sixth Leon H. Sullivan Summit. Is there a connection between them?**

**Young:** Yes, because in 1963, just before the March on Washington, Dr. King invited Leon Sullivan to come down to Atlanta to talk with us about his economic withdrawal program. We didn’t know how to deal with economic questions in the South — mainly because they called us Communists. And to talk economics meant you were more likely to be shot as a Communist. So we put the emphasis on public accommodations and education and politics. But we always knew that we had to deal with the economic questions and didn’t know how.

I suggested to Dr. King that we invite Leon Sullivan to Atlanta. And he came down to talk to us about their whole selective buying campaign in Philadelphia. That was the beginning of Operation Breadbasket, which then moved to Chicago and Jesse Jackson took over and made Operation PUSH. But the whole economic development wing of the movement didn’t come from Jesse Jackson or Martin Luther King. It first of all came from Leon Sullivan.

Now, Leon Sullivan’s genius was that he did not put himself in the forefront. He rotated the leadership so that all of the leaders had an opportunity to be involved. So we don’t know Leon Sullivan as well as we know Martin Luther King or Jesse Jackson. Leon Sullivan’s work has been just as effective. Even though Leon Sullivan didn’t get to speak at the March on Washington, his influence behind the scenes has been a powerful factor in the civil rights movement, and the movement for international affairs, the end of apartheid and also the development of these summits as a means of partnership between Africa and African Americans.

**FOCUS: Thank you.**
Africa Struggles for Global Attention

By Gumisai Mutume

Concern is growing among governments, policymakers and civil society groups that the international community is sidelining African priorities as it focuses on Iraq.

“My appeal to the main donors is that while they should attend to the reconstruction of Afghanistan and Iraq, Africa is also in dire need of resources to get rid of poverty, to be able to get safe water, to get education and so on,” Ugandan Finance Minister Gerald Ssendaula said during a recent visit to Washington, DC.

Since the September 2001 attacks on the United States, Washington and its allies have markedly shifted their foreign policy emphasis toward fighting international terrorism. Subsequently they waged two wars — removing the ruling Taliban in Afghanistan and President Saddam Hussein in oil-rich Iraq. Now, the massive resources being ploughed into humanitarian assistance and reconstruction in those two countries differ sharply with the response to African needs.

In March, the World Food Program (WFP) launched its single biggest humanitarian appeal ever — for $1.6 billion to feed 40 million people in Africa (a per person funding level significantly lower than the request for Iraq) was greeted with less enthusiasm and remains $1 billion short. In April, WFP Executive Director James Morris described the different donor responses to Iraq and Africa as “a double standard.” Why, he asked, do international donors “routinely accept a level of suffering and hopelessness in Africa we would never accept in any other part of the world?”

One of the worst affected countries on the continent is Ethiopia, where some 12.6 million people are threatened by starvation if there is no urgent response to appeals for assistance. “The situation in Ethiopia has been under-reported,” Tom Hall, U.S. ambassador to the U.N. food agencies, said recently. “Iraq and Afghanistan have taken up a lot of the news.” The U.S. is Ethiopia’s leading donor and has so far provided 40 percent of emergency food assistance this year.

Responding to critics, U.S. officials maintain that the focus on Iraq has not been at the expense of other regions. “I can categorically say that no money or resources have gone permanently to Iraq that would have gone to other recipients of American assistance,” U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) Administrator Andrew Natsios said. “The reality is that all of the money that is being used in Iraq comes from a separate budget appropriation.”

Natsios acknowledged, however, that confusion could have arisen from the fact that before the appropriation was approved, “we did take funds from regular USAID programs with the agreement from Congress that they would all get reimbursed.”

Some critics point out that the problem is not just one of limited resources amid multiple crises, but also of political will. “The speed with which political will and resources are mobilized to invade and bomb and possibly reconstruct Iraq are in stark contrast to the willingness of the rich countries to tackle poverty in Africa,” charged Phil Twyford, Oxfam International’s advocacy director.

For instance, in April Congress appropriated $79 billion for the initial costs of the Iraq war and for reconstruction. Such an amount would be adequate to finance HIV/AIDS prevention and treatment programs in low- and middle-income countries for about 10 years, based on UN estimates of the total costs. Yet the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria has raised only $2 billion since the initiative’s creation in 2001.

Differences are also evident when it comes to debt. While there is an equally pressing need to forgive the debts of poorer developing countries, the U.S. calls for the write-off of only Iraq’s foreign debt, estimated at between $62 billion...
and $130 billion. The U.S. has specifically requested that France, Russia and Kuwait — Iraq’s main creditors — cancel or reschedule that country’s debt. U.S. Treasury Secretary John Snow has said, “the Iraqi people cannot bear the burden of current debt levels.” But African countries can’t bear it either.

Despite receiving treatment under a World Bank and International Monetary Fund debt reduction program known as the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative, sub-Saharan Africa’s total debt stood at $204 billion last year. This was down from a peak of $231 billion in 1996, but significantly above the $177 billion registered at the beginning of the 1990s.

But it’s not just the money. The focus on Iraq also limits the time and effort diplomats have for African problems. In May, Britain’s Ambassador Jeremy Greenstock, who was to head a U.N. Security Council mission to seven African countries, reportedly postponed the trip to help formulate a U.S.-backed Security Council resolution aimed at lifting sanctions on Iraq. An article in The Washington Post said the postponement not only reflected the degree to which the Council’s focus on Iraq overshadowed other crises, “but also how powerful nations in the body can monopolize its attention on problems that they want solved while leaving others to fester.”

Disagreements among the major powers in the Security Council stalled a French-backed proposal to deploy multinational peacekeepers to Côte d’Ivoire in April. The peacekeepers were needed to complement forces from France and those from the Economic Community of West African States already serving in the country, which has been torn by months of civil war. In May, another urgent appeal for more peacekeepers, this one from the Democratic Republic of Congo, also suffered from political disagreements among the major powers.

After an initial rush by American humanitarian groups to participate in Iraqi reconstruction, some groups have withdrawn, citing security concerns and the need to deploy staff and resources to other more pressing crises around the world. In June, three of the country’s largest humanitarian organizations — Care, Worldvision and the International Rescue Committee — did not apply for new funding under USAID’s community action program for Iraq.

“We weren’t going to rob Peter and pay Paul and take people from other regions to send to Iraq,” said Worldvision Vice-President David Robinson. He said the organization wanted to focus on Africa where, the agency felt, there is a more pressing humanitarian need for its services.

Africa has rarely faced “the kind of intersecting challenges we see today,” said United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan. They include, he explained, food shortages, an escalating HIV/AIDS crisis, a number of armed conflicts and “an emaciated capacity to govern and provide services.”

Urgently addressing these issues requires a new integrated response from governments and the international community. Annan told the G-8 summit of major industrial nations in France: “It requires a shift from short-term approaches to a reassessment of our entire strategy for development — or taking long-term measures even when addressing short-term emergencies.” Importantly, he told the summit, there is a need to reverse the “alarming decline” in official aid for African agriculture that fell from $4 billion to $2.6 billion during the last decade. “You, the richest governments in the world, are among those best placed to provide these resources,” he said.

But on the continent there is skepticism about changes in donor responses. The director general of the South African president’s office, Frank Chikane, said terrorism and war as means of resolving human problems are currently overshadowing African priorities such as the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD), the continental development framework adopted in 2001.

For about a year, said Chikane, “many of us in the engine room of this noble African project” hoped that the response to the September 2001 attacks on the U.S. would not put the strategy on the back burner and set the continent back by many years. “Our little light of hope could be smothered by the weight of this new international crisis,” he warned.

Lesotho’s finance minister, Timothy Thahane, said many of the challenges facing Africa, such as attracting investment and dealing with HIV/AIDS, require long-term commitments, and these areas suffer the most when the focus shifts. “As people’s attention goes,” said Thahane, “you start all over again, you lose momentum.”

Some, however, feel that there could be a silver lining. The current situation “may well present African countries a forced opportunity to reform their high dependency on donor funds from the North,” said Akintola Odutola of the Centre for Health and Strategic Studies in Lagos, Nigeria. He says many countries depend, “perhaps too willingly, on foreign aid for basic survival.”

His sentiments echo those of South Africa President Thabo Mbeki, who feels that the diminished attention will force the continent to look inwards to a greater extent: “We will have to rely on ourselves, our own resources and our own efforts.”

Reprinted from Africa Recovery, a United Nations publication
Plan Seeks to Boost African Investment

Boosting foreign investment in Africa is critical to the continent's development. The Joint Center, along with the Institute for International Economics, the Corporate Council on Africa and the Council on Foreign Relations, sponsored research on increasing American investment there. The resulting report, A Ten-Year Strategy for Increasing Capital Flows to Africa, was produced by the Commission on Capital Flows to Africa and is adapted below.

Africa is a continent with great challenges, tremendous opportunities, and unappreciated accomplishments. Since 1990, for example, 42 of the 48 countries in sub-Saharan Africa have held multi-party elections, and most Africans today have the right to choose their leaders at the ballot box.

At the same time, Africa has fallen behind the rest of the developing world in many dimensions of development. Life expectancy has decreased with the rise of the HIV/AIDS pandemic. The average African is poorer today than he or she was two decades ago, and the number of people living in poverty has increased steadily during the past 20 years (although the share of Africa's population living in poverty has remained largely unchanged).

These broad trends, however, mask significant differences across the continent. While some countries remain mired in conflict and economic stagnation, nearly a dozen have achieved economic growth rates of 5 percent or more in the last five years. Senegal and Uganda, among others, have made major strides in combating HIV/AIDS.

Despite this important progress in some parts of Africa, even those African countries that have significantly improved their investment climates experience difficulty in attracting substantial new investment.

The United States has significant economic and national security interests in Africa. They extend well beyond historical and cultural ties or the humanitarian and moral imperative to help lift the most underdeveloped region out of poverty. Two broad areas of interest are worth highlighting: economic and security.

Economic Interests

Four out of every five new consumers now come from the developing world. Soon 1 billion of them will live in sub-Saharan Africa. In 2002, U.S. exports to sub-Saharan Africa were 46 percent greater than those to the former Soviet republics (Russia included), 47 percent greater than those to India, and nearly twice those to Eastern Europe. U.S. exports to South Africa alone were larger than those to Russia, whose population is more than 3.5 times as large. These numbers are even larger when the countries of North Africa are added.

Over 100,000 U.S. jobs are tied to exports to sub-Saharan Africa, which already buys at least $6 billion in American products annually. Yet, the U.S. share of the African market is small — only 7.9 percent, suggesting significant growth potential for the United States in the years to come. For this market to reach its potential, not only must the U.S. share grow but the market itself must grow as well. Such growth can be enhanced by increasing capital flows to Africa.

In addition to Africa's potential as a consumer market, U.S. economic interests include access to the continent's valuable resources. Africa supplies over 16 percent of U.S. imported crude oil, and it is estimated that within the next decade this will rise to 20 percent. Africa accounts for nearly half of the world's production of bauxite, chrome, and diamonds; more than half of its cocoa and platinum; and nearly three-quarters of its cobalt.

Security Interests

Even more important and immediate are U.S. national security interests in Africa. Africa is the world's soft under-belly for global terrorism. Porous borders, weak law enforcement and security institutions, plentiful and portable natural resources, disaffected populations, conflict zones, and fragile and failed states have made some African countries increasingly attractive safe-havens and breeding grounds for al Qaeda and other global terrorist organizations.

The 1998 U.S. embassy bombings in Kenya and Tanzania, the 2002 attacks in Mombasa, Kenya, and, most recently, in Morocco are all vivid reminders of the penetration of such groups into the continent.

Without increased stability, economic opportunity, and democratic progress, these states will grow even more vulnerable to exploitation by terrorist and criminal organizations and will remain substantial security liabilities for the United States. The American people, therefore, have a compelling national security interest in strengthening African economies and democratic institutions, as these increase the will and capacity of African countries to be strong partners in the war on terrorism.

Africa needs dramatically increased volumes of capital, especially investment capital, if it is going to achieve the sustained economic growth necessary to alleviate poverty and establish the institutions necessary for political stability. A substantial body of research suggests that there is a...
correlation between foreign direct investment (FDI) flows and economic growth, especially when there is an educated workforce and hospitable conditions for investment. The most important ingredients for a strong investment environment include sound macro-economic policy management, political freedom and stability, physical security, reliable legal frameworks, an open trading environment, competent institutions, and no corruption.

Africa has not done well in attracting foreign investment, and the facts are sobering. In sub-Saharan Africa, the volume of capital inflows fell from $8 billion in 1999 to $6.5 billion in 2000 and remained relatively stagnant in 2001. As a result, the region’s portion of global foreign investment flows is about 0.7 percent. The largest portion of this investment went to Africa’s extractive sectors (mainly oil and minerals), which tend to have a less pronounced impact on productivity and income growth than investments in other sectors such as manufacturing and services.

African governments must implement changes required to attract a substantially greater share of global capital flows. In fact, the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD) reflects the recognition by African governments that they must improve governance, transparency, and stability to induce donors, international businesses, and others to bridge the tremendous gap between Africa and the rest of the world. In this respect, the commission members support the efforts of the architects of NEPAD to create a Capital Flows Initiative.

It is too soon to know whether NEPAD will succeed. Nevertheless, the Commission on Capital Flows to Africa strongly endorses NEPAD’s vision of a compact predicated on the idea that as Africa undertakes critical political and economic reforms, the West must respond with substantial new public and private resources. Indeed, this vision was endorsed by the G-8 during its June 2002 summit, where it agreed to support the Africa Action Plan and committed to provide by 2006 an additional $6 billion annually to African countries undertaking significant economic and institutional reforms.

However, official development assistance (ODA), including World Bank lending, will not be sufficient to facilitate Africa’s integration into the global economy.

**Investment Strategy**

In this context, the Commission on Capital Flows to Africa has devised a 10-year strategy for investing in Africa, including both ODA and private capital flows, especially foreign investment. (See sidebar.) This strategy is broad in its coverage, ranging from trade, tax, and investment policy to debt relief, peer review, and exchange programs. At the same time, it includes specific steps that governments can take immediately to encourage capital flows and investment to Africa. In making these proposals, the commission recognizes that the same approach will not work everywhere in Africa. Greater attention needs to be paid to sub-regional initiatives, recognizing that sub-regions differ and that within each sub-region there are commercial and economic drivers in different sectors. Nevertheless, the strategy’s proposals provide broad guidance on some of the most important issues for African countries.

The strategy to boost African investment requires a multi-sided bargain. Clearly, the greatest responsibility for Africa’s growth lies in its own hands. If economic prosperity is to be achieved, African governments will have to accelerate the reform process. They will need to liberalize their economies, reduce their debt, and regenerate their health and education systems. If African governments fail to tackle these challenges, then no amount of foreign capital will suffice.

By the same token, if African governments take further significant steps toward the fulfillment of these tasks, then there is a great deal that outside partners can, and should, do to help. The United States and other nations can provide increased debt relief and a more aggressive and directed foreign assistance program. They can support NEPAD more actively and encourage the formation of substantially greater regional markets. Moreover, through the types of policy changes the commission recommends, they can also help to spur greater inflows of private capital, a powerful catalyst for growth.

---

**The Ten-Year Strategy for Increasing Capital Flows to Africa includes these recommendations:**

- The U.S. African Growth and Opportunity Act should be extended and allow for all products from Africa to enter the U.S. duty- and quota-free;
- The U.S. should complete a free trade agreement with Africa within 10 years;
- Congress should reduce to zero, over 10 years, the tax on repatriated earnings on new investments in Africa;
- Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) regulations should permit it to support investment in all sectors in Africa for 10 years, including sectors currently categorized as “sensitive,” such as textiles, electronics, agribusiness, and industrial products;
- OPIC regulations should permit investments that promise to provide net U.S. economic benefits, rather than prohibiting OPIC from supporting projects in which U.S. jobs are lost;
- A portion of U.S. official development assistance funds should be devoted to the establishment of long-term, low-rate financing for small African businesses;
- The U.S. should support consideration of more aggressive debt relief proposals;
- A significant portion of foreign assistance should be invested in strengthening Africa’s private sector.
ABUJA, Nigeria -- As President Bush concluded his trip to Africa in July, he noted that the heads of state he met “are committed to the spread of democratic institutions and democratic values throughout Africa.”

Yet while those institutions and values are indeed spreading, civil and human rights abuses remain plentiful.

In Nigeria, for example, about 30 protestors reportedly were arrested by Nigerian police on July 3 after they delivered a petition to the U.S. embassy that objected to Bush’s visit, according to Human Rights Watch. The protestors said the visit bestowed legitimacy on the government of Nigerian President Olusegun Obasanjo. “Five days later, they remained in detention without charge, in an undisclosed location,” Human Rights Watch reported.

As a young democracy, the institutions, the organizations and the traditions of Nigeria’s democratic system are in some ways still weak, as they were during the United States’ early history. But there is no doubt that human rights conditions in Nigeria are far better now than they have been during much of the nation’s turbulent history, most of which has been under military rule.

In a letter to Obasanjo, Human Rights Watch declared itself “heartened by some developments over the last four years, including greater respect for freedom of expression.” And the U.S. State Department’s 2002 human rights report, issued this March, says Nigeria demonstrated “improvements in several areas.” There were no reports of political prisoners and “there was a large and vibrant private domestic press that frequently was critical of the government,” the State Department said. Nonetheless, the overall conclusion in its report is that “the [Nigerian] government’s human rights record remained poor.”

As might be expected, the Nigerian government leadership views things differently. “Democracy and democratic governance have come to stay for good in Nigeria,” Atiku Abubakar, Nigeria’s vice president, told the Summit. “The success of Nigeria’s democratic transition as witnessed in the recent elections is a clear and unequivocal testimony to the institutionalization of democracy in our country.”

Not everyone agrees with that claim. The elections generated significant controversy, complaints of irregularities and more than a little cynicism.

Of continuing concern to human rights activists is the implementation of Sharia law in the Muslim dominated northern states. Human Rights Watch says “there are aspects of the legislation introduced in these states that do not conform to international human rights standards and that violate Nigeria’s obligations under international human rights law.”

Those violations include Sharia courts sentencing persons found guilty “to have their hands amputated for theft or armed robbery and to flogging for fornication, consumption of alcohol and other offenses,” according to a report by Amnesty International.

Not all human rights violations are committed by officials. Some are committed by private individuals, but are tolerated, or even permitted, by officials. For example, the State Department says Nigeria’s “Penal Code permits husbands to use physical means to chastise their wives as long as it does not result in ‘grievous harm,’ which is defined as loss of sight, hearing, power of speech, facial disfigurement, or other life threatening injuries.”

Another issue concerning women is genital mutilation, which is the removal of part, or all, of the female genitalia. The United Nations estimates 60 percent of Nigerian women have experienced it.

As with other human rights issues, practice lags far behind policy. “The [Nigerian] federal government publicly opposed FGM (female genital mutilation),” the State Department added, “however, it took no legal action to curb the practice.”

Serious problems remain with Nigeria’s security apparatus. “The national police, military and security forces committed extrajudicial killings and used excessive force to apprehend criminal suspects and to quell several incidents of ethno-religious violence,” the State Department report charged.

The killings and abuse spiked with the alleged massacre of hundreds civilians by the military in Odi, a town in Bayelsa State, in November 1999 and in several places in Benue State in October 2001. “There can be no justification for the absence of prosecutions for these crimes, which constitute two of the most serious incidents of human rights violations by the military since your government came to power in 1999,” Human Rights Watch told Obasanjo.

Given this record, the behavior of the Nigerian military peacekeepers now in Liberia will be of special interest to international human rights advocates.
The procrastination continued as all but a token of the troops remained onboard while the killing continued. Bush finally sent 200 Marines ashore on August 14. He had refused to do so until the Liberian president left the country and the opposing forces stopped fighting.

Nigerian President Olusegun Obasanjo had previously likened such a late deployment to firefighters who arrive at a burning building, then stand by and watch the flames. “Here I am, I have my water, my fire engine. Now, when you put the fire out in your house, I will come in,” he told the BBC. Liberian citizens’ sense of urgency and frustration before the U.S. intervened was so great that they piled bodies of war victims outside the American Embassy in Monrovia.

The situation dramatically improved with the departure of Charles Taylor, who resigned as president on August 11 and flew to a Nigerian exile. “I have accepted this role as the sacrificial lamb,” he said in his outgoing speech. Taylor’s self-serving description contrasted sharply with the image more widely applied to him, that of a brutal abuses of civilians perpetrated by his forces in Liberia, and for his use of child soldiers organized in ‘Small Boy Units.’

Taylor’s support for the Revolutionary United Front in Sierra Leone contributed to the killing continued. The 1998 bombing of U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania also demonstrated the strategic importance of Africa in the fight against terrorism.

A United Nations Special Court for Sierra Leone has indicted Taylor for “bearing the greatest responsibility” for unspeakable atrocities in Sierra Leone. An international arrest warrant was issued for Taylor, who has denied the charges.

After Taylor left Liberia, Human Rights Watch called on Nigeria to arrest him. Rory Mungoven, the organization’s global advocacy director, said “amnesty for Taylor would flout international law and would be an affront to his innumerable victims.”

Although his claimed innocence is not believed by many people knowledgeable of his rule, they do find some truth in Taylor’s further statement that “Our greatest friend and ally, the United States, refused to acknowledge the existence of a war in Liberia for so many years as death, murder and mayhem raged in the country.”

Condoleezza Rice, Bush’s national security adviser, didn’t even mention Liberia in prepared remarks to the National Association of Black Journalists in early August, as the country deteriorated.

“The arrival of U.S. troops brought cautious praise from the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC). “We’re moving in the right direction, but we need to move faster,” said Doug Thornell, the CBC’s communications director. Thornell said the administration’s more active role is “a welcome change,” but added that the Caucus “would like to see more of a commitment.” Rep. Elijah E. Cummings, a Baltimore Democrat and Caucus chairman, said the CBC was glad to see Taylor go and urged free and fair elections in Liberia. “Now, we call on the international community,” he added, “to assist the transitional government in the massive humanitarian effort needed to restore order and save lives.”

U.S. troops can help prevent a catastrophe, even if relatively few on the ships disembark. On the day Taylor left Monrovia, Secretary of State Colin Powell said Marines could help put the port back into operation, which would allow the distribution of provisions to severely food-deprived residents.

“There is a desperate need for food to be delivered,” Powell added. “The warehouses at the port that were full of food have essentially been looted and so we need to start the flow of humanitarian supplies again.”

The U.S. position on Liberia, as well as on HIV/AIDS and foreign assistance through his proposed Millennium Challenge Account were priority topics for Bush during his trip to the continent. Just before leaving Africa, Bush promised the Sixth Leon H. Sullivan Summit, meeting in Abuja, Nigeria, that “the United States will help this vast continent of possibilities to reach its full potential.” He promoted his $15 billion plan to fight AIDS globally and his proposed three-year Millennium Challenge Account, which would boost foreign aid worldwide by $5 billion.

Those promises, however, remain just that. No money for these proposals has yet been appropriated, let alone spent. Although the United States provides more foreign aid dollars than any other country, it ranks at the bottom among donor nations when its foreign aid is measured against its gross national income, according to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, a group of 30 affluent countries. The administration’s total request for aid to Africa next year is $2.17 billion, according to the Congressional Research Service (CRS). That’s 7.3 percent less than the aid budgeted this fiscal year and 11.3 percent lower than 2002. Meanwhile, the administration’s budget plan would increase U.S. assistance worldwide by 13.4 percent.

The proposed Africa budget could increase if more emergency food aid is required, as has been the case in previous years.

“If policy drives the budget, there needs to be more dollars for what has been the expressed policy of this administration,” said Rodney Slater, a member of the Joint Center’s board of governors who also was a Summit delegate and secretary of transportation under President Clinton.

Although foreign aid is critical, the U.S.-Africa relationship is not simply one between giver and taker. Africa is a significant U.S. trading partner, and increasingly so because of oil. Experts estimate that a fifth of America’s oil will come from Africa within the next decade. The 1998 bombing of U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania also demonstrated the strategic importance of Africa in the fight against terrorism.
against terrorism, particularly during this post 9/11 period. “Several African governments face particular dangers from terrorists, and the United States is working closely with those nations to fight terror, and we will do more,” Bush told the Summit. “I proposed a new $100 million initiative to help those governments in East Africa protect their people and to fight terrorist networks.”

Despite these hopeful statements, Bush’s proposed funding for military and peacekeeping assistance to the continent would be especially hard hit in next year’s budget. Rep. Donald Payne, of Newark, N.J., and other Democrats on the House International Relations Committee protested the proposed cut in the peacekeeping budget in a May 8 letter to congressional colleagues. “We feel the administration’s proposed decrease in the peacekeeping operations account is misguided and inconsistent with its own stated goals for developing Africa’s peacekeeping capacity,” the letter says.

The letter also criticizes the budget plan for weakening U.S. efforts to boost trade with Africa. Administration funding for African business, trade and investment programs would drop to $89 million next year, from $106 million currently and $152 million last year. In their letter, the House Democrats objected to this, writing, “Reductions in [economic] development assistance at this time actually undermine the full development potential of trade initiatives.”

U.S. trade with Africa already is greater than many realize. Last year, for example, U.S. exports to sub-Saharan Africa were 46 percent greater than those to the former Soviet states, including Russia, according to a June report by the Commission on Capital Flows to Africa. The report was cosponsored by the Joint Center. (A summary adaptation of the commission’s report appears on page 7.)

Even the centerpieces of the Bush administration’s Africa policy, money to fight HIV/AIDS and to fund his Challenge Account, are under scrutiny. Not only do they remain promises unfulfilled and unfunded, but how they would be implemented has raised concerns among Africa activists and researchers.

According to The Center for Global Development, a foreign assistance research group, the Challenge Account would provide funding for no more than a half-dozen African countries in the first of its three years.

And while Andrew Young, chairman of the Sullivan Summit, praised Bush for being “very responsive” on Africa, he also questioned how the AIDS money would be spent. AIDS activists have complained that the administration’s emphasis on abstinence programs, pushed by Bush’s conservative religious base, could interfere with more effective ways to fight the pandemic.

“I want to see where this money is going,” Young said in an Abuja interview. “I’ve heard about this $15 billion, but I don’t know who is spending it where.”

---

**The Joint Center in Africa**

The Joint Center has worked continuously in Africa since 1988. The first several years of that work enhanced the capacity of civil society organizations to deal more effectively with their respective governments. For example, the Joint Center provided administrative and program direction support to newly formed organizations advocating democratic reform in Botswana, Ghana, the Sudan, Ivory Coast, Sierra Leone, Senegal and South Africa.

South Africa, both before democracy and since, has been the focus of much of the Joint Center’s work in Africa. In the early 1990s, the Joint Center participated in a series of multiparty forums on critical aspects of electoral competition. The Joint Center’s Johannesburg office opened in 1993. It continued efforts to facilitate the country’s transition to democratic rule with studies in such areas as local governance, youth development, domestic violence and the application of social science research techniques to the legislative process. Through an audiotape project, recordings of local council meetings were played in taxivans.

During the last several years, the Joint Center has administered a variety of research with policy implications on such topics as land rentals, municipal service payments and the economic impact of HIV/AIDS. Other projects include research on rural electrification, the impact of climate change on South African agriculture and AIDS prevention for women and girls.
AFRICA SEeks Peace, Plans Security Panel

Peacekeeping Troops in Liberia

By GUMISAI MUTUME

While attention in the United States focused on whether Washington would send peacekeeping forces to Liberia, African countries demonstrated an increasing resolve to tackle the continent’s numerous conflicts.

In addition to Nigeria’s leading a West African peacekeeping force in Liberia, with U.S. backing, South Africa, Ethiopia and Mozambique announced in early April plans to deploy 3,500 peacekeepers to war-torn Burundi.

The countries first pledged to assist the Burundi mission at a February African Union (AU) summit in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Burundi’s decade-long civil war, which has taken some 200,000 lives, was one of several conflicts that came under scrutiny. The summit of 28 heads of state and six prime ministers noted that part of the solution to the continent’s conflicts lies in granting the AU significantly more powers than its predecessor, the Organization of African Unity.

The summit participants resolved to create a Peace and Security Council within the AU. Often referred to as the African equivalent of the UN Security Council, it would consist of 15 countries elected in rotation and eventually be able to draw on a stand-by African military force. An early warning mechanism would help the Council anticipate and prevent conflicts before they became full-blown wars. The Council also would be authorized to help in post-war reconstruction. Once established, it would have powers to mediate conflicts and “institute sanctions whenever an unconstitutional change of government takes place,” according to AU documents.

Such a Council could play an important role in Liberia today. Nigeria agreed to send 1,300 troops, augmented by others from Ghana and Mali, as part of a West African force that eventually may number over 3,000 in Liberia.

In July, African leaders on an ad-hoc basis assumed the role a Council could play after a bloodless coup in Sao Tome and Principe. Nigerian President Olusegun Obasanjo was among those helping to negotiate the return of President Fradique de Menezes, who was in Nigeria when the army took over his small island republic.

The need for an African based peacekeeping enforcement mechanism was demonstrated just a few weeks after the AU summit, when rebel leader François Bozizé seized power in the Central African Republic and declared himself head of state on March 15. General Bozizé, a former army chief-of-staff, had previously launched an unsuccessful bid for power in October 2002, but was repelled by Libyan troops guarding then president Ange-Félix Patassé. The Libyans withdrew earlier this year and were replaced by 300 troops from the Economic and Monetary Community of Central African States, who could not prevent the takeover.

Attention also is focused on Côte d’Ivoire and the Democratic Republic of Congo, which was examined in the July/August FOCUS. If a civil war peace agreement signed in January fails to hold in Cote d’Ivoire, war could spill over into neighboring countries, further aggravating the conflict’s regional impact.

Since Côte d’Ivoire is a major regional economic hub, accounting for some 40 percent of the gross domestic product of Francophone West Africa, the conflict has already seriously disrupted trade and other economic activities in several of its neighbors.

Despite the January peace agreement, the peace remains shaky. The success of the peace agreement, said United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan, depends to a large extent “on the adoption of measures to build trust and confidence between the parties.”

Reprinted from Africa Recovery, a United Nations publication.