



ADVOCACY NETWORK FOR AFRICA . ADNA

STATEMENT



JUNE 24, 2013

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This Briefing booklet was compiled by the African Advocacy Network (ADNA) as a means of collecting relevant materials on critical issues related to U.S. Africa policy.

The statement will be used to inform meetings with the Obama Administration and Congress.

THE ADVOCACY NETWORK FOR AFRICA

Informing + Mobilizing US Grassroots Advocacy

Our History

Under the name of the Southern Africa Working Group (SAWG), this network was founded to share information and mobilize action in solidarity with the anti-Apartheid and grassroots liberation movements of the Southern African countries still remaining under white minority rule. With the successes of those movements during the late 80s and early 90s, SAWG needed to rename itself and define a new agenda. Adopting the new name - The Advocacy Network for Africa (ADNA) - it took up the task of addressing a broad spectrum of US/Africa foreign policy issues, with an expanded focus on sub-Saharan Africa, and some attention to the northern African countries.

Our Purpose

Today, ADNA has three primary objectives:

- In Washington, DC we work to raise the level of understanding and attention to current events in Africa and in International policy and funding with Members of Congress, with the President, with key Administration officials, and in international organizations like the United Nations and the World Bank.
- Additionally, we work nationally and internationally through the organizational members and contact networks to increase the flow of dependable and timely action-oriented information shared among the Africa advocacy community here in the US, and between US-based and African grassroots groups.
- Finally, we mobilize progressive US voters across the country to be politically active on key US/Africa and International policy issues.

What We Do

The key to mounting effective popular political pressure on policy makers at the national and international level is to build a broad based, well-informed and persistently active constituency, especially where those officials are elected and accountable to the citizens. Collaboration among our organizations expands our reach and magnifies our effect. We share background information and action strategies such as situation updates from our partners in Africa, Action Alerts, petition campaigns, letter-writing and call-in campaigns, advocacy days, public vigils and demonstrations, and other creative ideas through an e-mail communications system.

This statement

spotlights 3 points of concern from members of the Africa Advocacy Network (ADNA):

1. Militarization of US policy toward Africa;
2. Food, Agricultural Investment, Land Grabs;
3. Financial Integrity and Economic Development.



• Egypt

• Mali

• Congo

• Angola

• Malawi

• South Africa

Militarization of U.S. Policy Towards Africa

We are opposed to the Western focus on building larger, more politically powerful, more technologically equipped, and more expensive militaries in African countries. This reflects a policy based on a belief - and on a habit - that military solutions are the first step toward peace. Military responses to conflict and contestation are often counter-productive in the long term and results in gross violations of human rights and deaths of civilians.

The introduction of the philosophy and strategy of the Global War on Terror (or "overseas contingency operations") into Africa with aggressive militarization has not and will not facilitate peace and will continue to contribute to human rights violations.

The policy of the *whole of government* approach to combine State Department, US AID, and Department of Defense policy and planning is a mistake to the extent that it erases the important differences between traditional policy making by the civilian arm of the executive Branch such as the Department of State and USAID and the implementation of a military, security focused policy, driven by DOD.

We are especially disturbed at the explosive growth of the DOD in policy assessment and policy-making, in the

relative numbers of U.S. military personnel representing the U.S. in Africa, in the militarization of the programs of the Department of State and USAID, and in the apparent decline of the role, influence, and resources of the State Department and USAID.

We are deeply troubled at the broad and hidden engagement in dozens of African countries of the U.S. Special Operations Command-Africa troops with a mandate "to disrupt, degrade, dismantle and ultimately defeat those who attacked America on 9/11 -- al-Qaeda" and "affiliated movements" without any opportunity for public policy debate about the targets of their attacks and nature of their actions or for any broader reflection on both the collateral civilian damage, the license to take action without public accountability, and the wisdom and effectiveness of a military suppression of dissidence.

We are especially concerned that the strategies of aerial attacks since 2007 in Somalia and potentially now in the rest of the Sahelian Region - by C-130 Hercules gunships, attack helicopters, cruise missiles, and now by drones from the four bases in Africa and from Europe - can be a source of mounting collateral deaths of civilians and blowback in facilitating the recruitment of new militants.

We advocate more U.S. support and resources for human rights, conflict resolution, and negotiation in Africa in order to develop long-term peace based on the often difficult agreements among different legitimate stakeholders, including the many varieties of Islamic and Islamist organizations across Africa.

With this emphasis on conflict resolution, additional funds are needed for economic development activities in health, education, housing, and infrastructure as incentives for conflicting groups to come to the table and to begin to build cooperation across lines of conflict for the reconstruction of disrupted civil society.

Food, Agricultural Investment & Land Grabs

President Obama's trip to Africa comes one year after announcing the New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition at the 2012 G8 Summit. The President's stop in Tanzania will draw attention to this cooperation between private companies and governments.

However, this alliance is not the anti-poverty "alliance" it claims to be because it turns away from the G8 commitments of \$22 billion in public investment in agriculture made at L'Aquila in 2009 in response to the 2008 food crisis. Instead of maintaining and expanding public investment, the New Alliance rolls public sector investment together with those of the large private agribusiness sector as if the two are similar in effect.

The New Alliance is not new because it represents G8 endorsement of the private sector initiative Grow Africa, which has been working to obtain policy change commitments from African governments that favor large private investors. Although promising to benefit poor farmers, the New "Alliance" has not involved organizations representing these smallholders who form the largest portion of the private sector throughout Africa.

Many African smallholder organizations and other sectors of civil society have denounced the framework agreements for this lack of inclusivity, as well as the alliance's promotion of market dominance by large companies

selling machinery, chemicals, and genetically modified seeds.

The New Alliance cannot be evaluated by focusing on projects which promise benefits for smallholders. Instead it should be evaluated on what happens on the ground and on the likely overall effects of promoting large agribusiness growth in Africa instead of types of public investment aimed at strengthening smallholder agriculture, which has been effective in many Asian countries.

We are concerned that the New Alliance will justify and facilitate land-grabbing by a wide array of investors inside and outside Africa as diverse as Saudi Arabia, India, Brazil, China, the U.S., and local wealthy elites in Africa and endorses the creation of land banks for large investors in several countries, prior to fully implementing the land tenure guidelines of the UN Committee on World Food Security to ensure that community land rights are respected and that the needs of the landless rural poor are met.

The New Alliance frameworks give incentives to large agricultural machinery, fertilizer, and chemical companies which will be primarily interested in doing business with highly mechanized farms and encourages additional land acquisitions for large farms. This ignores research showing that smallholder farmers have a higher potential production per land area

than large farms.

The New Alliance also undermines the Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Program (CAADP) of the African Union as smallholders and civil society, and countries have been admitted to the New Alliance without meeting their public investment goals required under CAADP.

The New Alliance also gives new tax breaks to agribusinesses, eliminating potential revenue sources for public investment. The New Alliance commits countries to changing their seed laws to end the public distribution of seeds. It also favors the large seed monopolies and their introduction of genetically modified seeds despite the risks that these crops will undermine food security by increasing costs and decreasing genetic diversity.

Our key recommendations are to establish regional food reserves, end biofuels incentives, help farmers adapt to climate and empower African women farmers.



Climate Change in Africa

"I am a farmer. My mother was a farmer. For my mother, rains used to come from October to April. Today, because of climate change, the rains come in December and end in March. Our local varieties do not have time to mature. We are forced to buy hybrid crops, which are much more input intensive, and we cannot afford these inputs. We are poor. So we are starving in Malawi."

Joyce Tembenu
*Widow & Mother of 3
Farmer - Salima District, Malawi*

Climate change is one of the greatest obstacles to ending poverty and one of the gravest equity challenges of our time. Impoverished countries have done least to create the climate crisis, yet are being hit first and worst by its impacts, including extreme weather events, sea-level rise, drought, and disruption of water and food supplies. Poor countries and communities have the least capacity to deal with such impacts.

Africa is one of the continents that will be most affected by climate change, and food production will be particularly threatened. According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), in some countries in Africa, yields from rain-fed agriculture could be reduced by up to 50% by 2020 as a result of climate change. This will mean increased hunger and famines across an already food insecure continent. Water resources across Africa will also be severely impacted; by 2020, 75-250 million people across Africa could face more severe water shortages due to climate change.

Women in Africa who are primarily responsible for food production and provision and for gathering water will be particularly affected. As crop yields decline and water resources diminish, women's workloads will expand, jeopardizing their chances to work outside

the home, attend school, or attend to other tasks.

In order to halt the impacts of climate change that will deeply affect Africa, it is essential for developed countries to drastically reduce their emissions of greenhouse gasses that are causing climate change. According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Africa is expected to warm at around 1.5 times the global average. It is essential that the United States work with other developed countries to ensure that global temperatures do not rise beyond 1.5 degrees Celsius above preindustrial levels. Warming beyond this level will have devastating impacts for Africa.

It is equally important for developed countries to dedicate substantial new resources to help countries in Africa adapt to the impacts of climate change, and to ensure that funding gets channeled through a fund or institution accountable to poor people. In December 2010, at the Cancun climate conference, developed countries agreed to jointly mobilize \$100 billion per year by 2020 for adaptation and mitigation in developing countries. The US portion of this funding is approximately \$25 billion per year by 2020.

There are numerous mechanisms available to developed countries to allow them to scale-up public financing for

climate change and ensure that funding is new and additional to Overseas Development Assistance (ODA), is in the form of grants, and does not draw and already deep deficits in developed countries. Taxing the financial sector, redirecting fossil fuel subsidies, using IMF Special Drawing Rights, and mechanism within the shipping and aviation sectors are all viable options which can generate billions of new public finance. The US must yet to publicly support for any of these mechanisms; it must do so by the climate summit in Durban, South Africa, in December 2011 (referred to as COP 17).

Finally, it is essential that this funding gets channeled through an institution which is accountable to poor people. The Cancun climate conference in December 2010 launched the Green Climate Fund (GCF). The GCF will be designed this year by a Transitional Committee, which includes the participation of the U.S.

It is essential that the Green Climate Fund gets designed in a way to ensure:

- 1) A representative governance structure with civil society and affected communities on the board
- 2) community participation in all layers of decision making of the GCF
- 3) Streamlined and direct access to funding,
- 4) No economic policy conditionality, and
- 5) Sustainable and compensatory funding.

Our specific recommendations to the U.S. are:

• Establish a plan to ensure a US emission reduction commitment beyond the 3% below 1990 levels already committed. The US should endorse a global temperature rise no more than 1.5 percent beyond preindustrial levels.

• Dedicate new and additional funding for adaptation. The United States must show its support by COP 17 for innovative mechanism to generate public funding. Possible mechanisms to generate the needed finance include the use of levies in the shipping and aviation sectors, a financial transaction tax, and use of Special Drawing Rights.

• Work through the Transitional Committee to ensure that the Green Climate Fund

1) is governed by a representative board which includes civil society and affected communities with voting power,

2) includes community participation in all layers of decision making of the GCF,

3) ensures streamlined and direct access to funding,

4) includes no economic policy conditionality, and,

5) provides sustainable and compensatory funding.

Financial Integrity & Economic Development

We believe the United States should seek to promote greater financial transparency and integrity among African stakeholders, U.S. investors in African projects and in their transactions with the rest of the world.

Illicit financial flows, the size of the underground economy, and the business climate are all intimately linked to financial transparency and integrity.

There is ample evidence of massive cross-border flow of illegal funds from African countries which harbor booming underground economies linked with government and corporate corruption

ADVOCACY NETWORK FOR AFRICA . ADNA

