Arhe XXI, 42/2024
UDK 179
338.434
338.43 Gates B.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.19090/arhe.2024.42.151-179
Originalni naučni rad
Original Scientific Article

IVICA KELAM[1]
Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek, Faculty of Education/Faculty of Dental Medicine and Health, Croatia

BIOETHICAL ASPECTS OF PHILANTHROCAPITALISM IN AGRICULTURE

Abstract: This paper explores the bioethical aspects of philanthrocapitalism in agriculture, focusing on the Gates Foundation's activities in the Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA). The Foundation has played a pivotal role in AGRA's mission to transform African agriculture by promoting modern techniques and inputs, such as genetically modified seeds and synthetic fertilisers. Proponents argue that this initiative could significantly enhance productivity and food security in Africa. However, critics highlight bioethical issues, including the creation of dependency on external agricultural inputs, the marginalisation of small farmers, the displacement of traditional agricultural practices, the promotion of genetically modified crops, and the Foundation's significant influence on national agricultural policies. This paper will analyse these bioethical issues and evaluate their implications for African farmers, local communities, and food sovereignty. It will stress the crucial need for an inclusive, transparent, and equitable approach to agricultural development that respects local knowledge and prioritises sustainable and ecological agricultural practices, as this is essential for the ethical advancement of agriculture.
Keywords: bioethics, Bill Gates, Gates Foundation, AGRA, agriculture

INTRODUCTION

Philanthrocapitalism, a term that blends philanthropy and capitalism, represents a contemporary approach to philanthropy where the wealth generated through business activities is leveraged to address

1 Author's e-mail address: kelamivica@gmail.com

global social challenges. This model is characterised by applying business principles and market-driven strategies to philanthropic activities to achieve measurable social impact. The rise of philanthrocapitalism has been marked by a new class of mega-donors, including tech billionaires like Bill Gates, who use his wealth to influence education, healthcare, and agriculture globally. The philosophy underpinning philanthrocapitalism is that the same methods that create wealth in the private sector—efficiency, innovation, and a focus on results—can be applied to solve complex societal problems. Proponents argue that this approach can drive significant positive change by bringing more resources, expertise, and accountability to the nonprofit sector. They also believe that philanthrocapitalism can complement or even supplant traditional government and nonprofit efforts by being more agile and results-oriented. However, philanthrocapitalism has also sparked considerable debate and criticism. Critics argue that it can lead to the concentration of power in the hands of a few wealthy individuals, potentially undermining democratic processes and public accountability. They also contend that the market-based approach may prioritise projects with clear, quantifiable outcomes over those that address deeper, systemic issues, which are often harder to measure and solve. Additionally, concerns have been raised about the long-term sustainability of initiatives driven by philanthrocapitalism, as they may create dependencies rather than empower communities. This paper explores the bioethical issues surrounding Bill Gates' influence on African countries' food production and agricultural policies. The paper will consist of four parts; in the first part, we will briefly explain the emergence of philanthrocapitalism and its principal designation. In the second part, we will outline the work of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. The third part will explain AGRA's short history and development. Finally, in the fourth part, we will analyse bioethical issues regarding Gates's influence in AGRA.

PHILANTHROCAPITALISM

Philanthrocapitalism is a term that was coined in 2006 by Matthew Bishop in an article 'The birth of philanthrocapitalism' published in *The Economist* magazine and was later developed most comprehensively in the book *Philanthrocapitalism: How the Rich Can Save The*

World first published in 2008 by Matthew Bishop and Michael Green[2]. The book was endorsed by Bill Clinton, who wrote in its foreword that this concept drives the Clinton Foundation, quoting: "I've tried to increase the momentum and impact of those in philanthrocapitalism through the Clinton Global Initiative (CGI). Since 2005, we've invited philanthropists, political leaders, business executives, leaders of nongovernmental organizations, college presidents and students, and citizen activists from around the world to meet in New York at the opening of the U.N. They discuss the big how questions, develop their own answers, and make specific commitments to implement them. To date, members have made more than 1,400 commitments valued at $46 billion that have already improved the lives of more than 200 million people in 150 countries. CGI is, in many ways, the laboratory in which the authors' ideas about philanthrocapitalism are tested. At its best, philanthrocapitalism reinforces and amplifies the time, money, skills, and gifts given every year by people who are not rich, and it informs and enhances government policies."[3] According to Bishop and Green, philanthrocapitalist is defined in the following way: "They apply their business methods to philanthropy, philanthrocapitalists are developing a new (if familiar-sounding) language to describe their businesslike approach. Their philanthropy is 'strategic,' 'market conscious,' 'impact oriented,' 'knowledge based,' often 'high engagement,' and always driven by the goal of maximizing the 'leverage' of the donor's money. Seeing themselves as social investors, not traditional donors, some of them engage in 'venture philanthropy.' As entrepreneurial 'philanthropreneurs,' they love to back social entrepreneurs who offer innovative solutions to society's problems."[4] One of the big differences regarding the old philanthropy is the profit motive in philanthropy, about which Bishop and Green write: "philanthrocapitalists are increasingly trying to find ways of harnessing the profit motive to achieve social good. To say the least, this is controversial: isn't philanthropy supposed to be about giving away money, not making more of it? But as the philanthrocapitalists see it, if they can use their donations to create a prof-

2 Bishop, M., Green, M. *Philanthrocapitalism: How the Rich Can Save The World*, New York, Bloomsbury Press, 2008.

3 Ibid, 4 p.

4 Ibid, 6 p.

itable solution to a social problem, it will attract far more capital, far faster, and thus achieve a far bigger impact, far sooner, than would a solution-based entirely on giving money away. Thus, their money can lever, in a good cause, some of the trillions of dollars in the for-profit business world. This is very different from traditional corporate philanthropy, which has often been ineffective: giving away small sums of money typically to generate positive publicity rather than change the world."[5] Bishop and Green, in their book, use the term 'hyperagents' to explain the role and importance of philanthrocapitalists in society. According to them: "Philanthrocapitalists are 'hyperagents' who have the capacity to do some essential things far better than anyone else. Like politicians, they do not face elections every few years or suffer the tyranny of shareholder demands for ever-increasing quarterly profits, like CEOs of most public companies. Nor do they have to devote vast amounts of time and resources to raising money, like most heads of NGOs. That frees them to think long-term, to go against conventional wisdom, to take up ideas too risky for government, to deploy substantial resources quickly when the situation demands it—above all, to try something new."[6]

On the other hand, critics disagree with this thesis about philanthrocapitalists as hyper agents. For example, scholar Linsey McGoey fiercely criticises philanthrocapitalism in her book *No Such Thing as a Free Gift*, which discusses three main concerns philanthrocapitalism raises. The first concern centres on the accountability and transparency of private philanthropic players – or lack thereof. McGoey takes, for example, the Gates Foundation, which provides 10 per cent of the World Health Organization's overall budget. In the last few years, beginning in 2013, it emerged as the largest single donor to the UN health agency, donating more than the US government. According to its charter, the WHO is meant to be accountable to member governments. The Gates Foundation, on the other hand, is accountable to no one other than its three trustees: Bill, Melinda, and Berkshire Hathaway CEO Warren Buffett. Many civil society organisations fear that the WHO's independence will be compromised when a significant portion of its budget comes from a private philanthropic organisation with the power

5 Ibid
6 Ibid, 12 p.

to stipulate precisely where and how the UN institution spends its money.[7] McGoey's second concern is that philanthropy erodes support for governmental spending on health and education by channelling private funds towards public services. Private philanthropy is no substitute for hard-fought battles over labour laws and social security, partly because philanthropy can be retracted on a whim. At the same time, in theory, elected officials have citizens to answer to. The tension between private philanthropy and public spending has become clear in recent battles over public education in the United States. Often working in collaboration, three powerful 'mega-foundations' – the Gates Foundation, the Walton Family, and the Broad Foundation – are helping to build one of the fastest-growing industries in the United States: secondary and primary schools run on a for-profit basis.[8]

According to McGoey, the third primary concern is that many philanthropists, both today and in the past, earned their fortunes through business strategies that greatly exacerbate the same social and economic inequalities that philanthropists purport to remedy. The great industrialists of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were dubbed robber barons due to the widespread condemnation of their predatory business tactics. Today, some of the world's most celebrated philanthropists, from Gates to George Soros, earned billions through business tactics that have compounded financial instability, eroded labour protections, and entrenched global economic inequalities.[9] In her book, McGoey quotes the opinion of Mitch Kapor, the billionaire co-founder of Lotus Software and a long-time business rival of Gates throughout the 1980s and 1990s: "It's incontestable that under Gates's leadership Microsoft exercised its monopoly power to unfairly stifle competition. This was the main finding of fact in the US Department of Justice anti-trust case against Microsoft. The resulting Gates fortune, the majority of which is now being distributed by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, was accumulated in some measure through ill-gotten means."[10]

7 McGoey L. *No such thing as a free gift*, London, Verso, 2015.
8 Ibid.
9 Ibid.
10 Ibid, 5 p.

BILL AND MELINDA GATES FOUNDATION

The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation is the world's largest and most powerful philanthropic foundation. According to the latest official data, the Foundation currently has 2026 employees. The total Foundation Trust Endowment value is $75.2 billion and The total grant payments since its inception in 2000 (through Q4 2023) are $77.6 billion. In 2023, total direct grantee support was $7.7 billion.[11]

In 2000, Bill and Melinda Gates established the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation based on the belief that 'every life has equal value', which aims to 'help reduce inequities in the United States and around the world'. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation points out that its 15 guiding principles 'reflect the Gates family's beliefs about the role of philanthropy and the impact they want this foundation to have'. Thus, it is vital to briefly examine these principles to understand the type of work the foundation believes it is engaged in. Many of those guiding principles suggest that the foundation respects the role of the community in dealing with social problems. Thus, they observe that: 'We treat our grantees as valued partners, and we treat the ultimate beneficiaries of our work with respect'; 'We treat each other as valued colleagues'; 'We must be humble and mindful in our actions and words'; and crucially they note that, 'Philanthropy plays an important but limited role'. However, as one might expect of the world's largest foundation, there are limits to the respect they have for the beneficiaries of their work, as although they suggest that philanthropy should play a 'limited role', this is not borne out by the fact that in 2023 alone the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation distributed over $ 7,7 billion.[12] Indeed, other principles that guide the foundation's work which suggest their acknowledgement of a social engineering role for the foundation include: the foundation will be 'driven by the interests and passions of the Gates family'; 'We are funders and shapers'; 'Our focus is clear'; 'We advocate – vigorously but responsibly – in our areas of focus'; and 'Meeting our mission ... requires great stewardship of the money we have available'. Thus, given the enormous amounts of money involved, it is hard to

11 Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, *Who we are*, https://www.gatesfoundation.org/Who-We-Are/General-Information/Foundation-Factsheet, accessed: August 3, 2024.
12 Ibid.

reconcile the foundation's vision of itself as 'funders and shapers' with its final guiding principle: 'We leave room for growth and change'.[13] It is evident from these few quotes that the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation sees its role as a powerful force for change, as will be evident in the analysis of its role in the establishment and management of AGRA and its role in the transformation of African agriculture.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT AND DEVELOPMENT OF AGRA

The Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA) was founded in 2006 with the ambitious goal of transforming African agriculture. Supported primarily by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation, AGRA aims to enhance agricultural productivity, improve food security, and lift millions out of poverty by adopting modern farming techniques. Inspired by the successes of the Green Revolution in Asia and Latin America, AGRA promotes the use of high-yielding seed varieties, synthetic fertilisers, and advanced agricultural technologies. However, while the initiative has received substantial financial backing and political support, it also raises significant bioethical concerns that warrant thorough examination. In the press release on the occasion of the founding of AGRA, Bill Gates pointed out: „Now it's Africa's turn. This is only the beginning of the continent's Green Revolution. The end goal is that within 20 years, farmers will double or even triple their yields and sell the surplus at market. This is a vision of a new Africa, where farmers aren't doomed to a life of hunger and poverty, where people can look toward the future with promise."[14] The Gates Foundation has set itself a huge task to increase agricultural yields by two to three times within 20 years to enable farmers to sell excess yields on the world market and thus reduce hunger and poverty. From this statement, Gates' incredible dose of arrogance and insensitivity to comprehend the causes of poverty and hunger in many African countries is visible because, according to Gates, it is enough to enable farmers to increase yields and include them in the market. All the deep structural problems of hunger and poverty will be solved. Below, we

13 Ibid.

14 Grain, *Another silver bullet for Africa?*, https://grain.org/en/article/160-another-silver-bullet-for-africa, accessed: August 3, 2024.

will see how wrong Gates' opinion was, with catastrophic consequences for millions of African farmers and their families.

AGRA was conceived to respond to African agriculture's persistent challenges, including low productivity, food insecurity, and rural poverty. The initiative was launched with a vision to spur a Green Revolution tailored to the unique conditions of Africa by promoting many industrial, agricultural practices that were integral elements of earlier Green Revolutions, such as those in Mexico and India between the 1940s and 1970.[15] AGRA aimed to increase agricultural productivity by introducing scientifically developed seeds, improving soil health, enhancing water management, and providing access to credit and markets for farmers. Apart from productivity aspects, AGRA's program is characterised by a robust market-driven approach based on the idea that African smallholder farmers must be more effectively integrated into the global agricultural economy to increase income and reduce poverty.[16] The strengthening of the agricultural research system, development of new financing mechanisms, and establishing an appropriate political and legislative environment AGRA describes as additional goals.[17] Over the years, AGRA has received billions of dollars in funding, primarily from the Gates Foundation, which has been instrumental in shaping its strategic direction and implementation.[18] From the very beginning, AGRA was understood as a critical factor that has the potential to profoundly reshape future development and include African agriculture in the dominant industrial-corporate model of agriculture. Because of this, AGRA's activities have been increasingly criticised since its inception by non-governmental organisations and independent experts, who emphasise that the AGRA approach lacks overall effectiveness and does

15 The African Centre for Biosafety, *Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA): Laying the groundwork for the commercialisation of African Agriculture*, https://acbio.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/AGRA_critique.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

16 Toenniessen, G., Adesina, A. & de Vries, J., Building an Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*. 2008, 1136(1):233-242.

17 Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA). *Building on the New Momentum in African Agriculture. AGRA in 2008*, https://agra.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/agra-annual-report-2008.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

18 Patel, R. The Long Green Revolution. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*. 2013, 40(1): 1-63.

not sufficiently address the needs of small African farmers.[19] Many of these critics argue that AGRA does not consider alternative ways of agricultural development and primarily acts as a gateway for diverse corporate and political interests from the Global North. A growing number of actors from civil society and academia have questioned the legitimacy of AGRA and publicly called on AGRA's partners to end their support, which will be explained later in the paper.

BIOETHICAL ISSUES OF GATES' INFLUENCE IN *AGRA*

Below, we will analyse some of Bill Gates' statements to understand better his motivation and actions in promoting his vision of agriculture and the work of AGRA. In 2012, Bill Gates told the international agricultural community it had fallen short of delivering the help small farmers in developing countries need when they need it. In a speech de-

19 Here, we list some of the critics of the AGRA policy, Daño, E. C. 2007. *Unmasking the New Green Revolution in Africa: Motives, Players and Dynamics*. Penang: Third World Network.; Holt-Giménez, E. & Altieri, M. A. 2012. Agroecology, Food Sovereignty, and the New Green Revolution. *Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems*. 37(1):90-102; Holt-Giménez, E. 2008. Out of AGRA: The Green Revolution returns to Africa. *Development*. 51(4):464-471.; Ignatova, J.A. 2017. The 'philanthropic' gene: Biocapital and the new green revolution in Africa. *The Third World Quarterly*. 38(10):2258-2275; Bassey, M. 2012. AGRA's *Technology Push in Africa*. https://www.foei.org/resources/publications/publications-bysubject/food-sovereignty-publications/agras-technology-push-in-africa, accessed: August 3, 2024; Belay, M. & Mugambe, B. 2021. Bill Gates Should Stop Telling Africans What Kind of Agriculture Africans Need. *Scientific American.* https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/bill-gates-should-stop-telling-africans-what-kind-of-agricultureafricans-need1/, accessed: August 3, 2024; Belay, M. & Wise, T.A. 2019. The Battle for the Future of Food in Africa. *Common Dreams.* https://www.commondreams.org/views/2019/11/01/battle-futurefood-africa, accessed: August 3, 2024; Wise, T.A. 2021. *AGRA Update: Withheld internal documents reveal no progress for Africa's farmers.* https://www.iatp.org/blog/202102/agra-update-withheld-internal-documents-revealno-progress-africas-farmers, accessed: August 3, 2024; Wise, T. A. 2021. *New AGRA Reports Offer Little Evidence to Justify Continued Donor Support.* https://www.iatp.org/documents/new-agra-reports-offer-little-evidence-justifycontinued-donor-support, accessed: August 3, 2024; Wise, T. A. 2020. *Failing Africa's Farmers: An Impact Assessment of the Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa*. Working Paper No. 20-01. Global Development and Environment Institute. https://sites.tufts.edu/gdae/files/2020/07/20-01_Wise_FailureToYield.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024; Wise, T. A. 2020. *Pressure builds on Gates Foundation, AGRA for accountability.* https://www.iatp.org/blog/202010/pressure-builds-gates-foundation-agra-accountability, accessed: August 3, 2024.

livered at the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), Gates asked the UN bodies responsible for fighting hunger and poverty to unite around a common global target for sustainable productivity growth to guide and measure their efforts. "If you care about the poorest, you care about agriculture. Investments in agriculture are the best weapons against hunger and poverty, and they have made life better for billions of people. The international agriculture community needs to be more innovative, coordinated, and focused to help poor farmers grow more. If we can do that, we can dramatically reduce suffering and build self-sufficiency."[20] Gates told IFAD, the World Food Program (WFP) and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) that today's approach to fighting poverty and hunger is outdated and ineffective. He urged these food agencies to commit to a concrete, measurable goal of increasing agricultural productivity and to support a public scorecard system to increase transparency for themselves, donors and the countries they support. "The goal is to move from examples of success to sustainable productivity increases to hundreds of millions of people moving out of poverty. If we hope to meet that goal, it must be a goal we share. We must be coordinated in our pursuit of it. We must embrace more innovative ways of working toward it. And we must be willing to be measured on our results."[21] According to estimates cited by Gates in 2012, the number of hungry people globally reached 1 billion. Nevertheless, Gates believes small farmers in South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa can double or nearly triple their yields in the next 20 years. Gates concludes that this sustained increase in productivity will lift 400 million people out of poverty. As seen from Gates' above statements, the only way out of the vicious cycle of poverty and hunger is to increase agricultural production. In order to achieve this through the AGRA mission, it is necessary to introduce high-yielding hybrid seed varieties, including genetically modified ones, into African agriculture crops combined with artificial fertilisers. Critics of AGRA and genetically modified crops interpret Gates as standing in the way of progress

20 Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, *Helping Poor Farmers, Changes Needed to Feed 1 Billion Hungry*, https://www.gatesfoundation.org/ideas/media-center/press-releases/2012/02/helping-poor-farmers-changes-needed-to-feed-1-billion-hungry, accessed: August 3, 2024.

21 Ibid.

that offers high-yielding hybrid seed varieties and genetically modified crops, as he stated in 2009 in his first address on agriculture made during the annual World Food Prize forum when he said: "This global effort to help small farmers is endangered by an ideological wedge that threatens to split the movement in two. Some people insist on an ideal vision of the environment. But some people insist on an ideal vision of the environment – divorced from people and their circumstances. They have tried to restrict the spread of biotechnology into Sub-Saharan Africa without regard to how much hunger and poverty might be reduced by it, or what the farmers themselves might want."[22] Gates confirms his blind faith in technological solutions when, in the continuation of the speech, he emphasises the importance of biotechnology and the role of corporations in the sustainability of African agriculture: "The technology and new approaches that are transforming agriculture in other parts of the world can be applied in new ways, and help Africa flourish too. We have to develop crops that can grow in a drought; that can survive in a flood; that can resist pests and disease. We need higher yields on the same land in harsher weather. And we will never get it without a continuous and urgent science-based search to increase productivity – especially on small farms in the developing world. We need to take full advantage of these emerging technologies to develop healthy new crop varieties – and we need to make the seeds available to the small farmers who need them. And we need corporations to play a larger role. Research companies can take the technologies they've developed for big agriculture and apply them to the needs of small farmers. Food companies can use their buying power to provide markets for small farmers."[23] Today, 15 years after this Gates speech and 18 years after the founding of AGRA, the results are disastrous. Everything that the critics of AGRA pointed out has come true, as seen below.

22 Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, *2009 World Food Prize Symposium*, https://www.gatesfoundation.org/ideas/speeches/2009/10/bill-gates-2009-world-food-prize-symposium, accessed: August 3, 2024.
23 Ibid.

A brief overview of the failure of Gates and AGRA agricultural policy

Although the Gates Foundation founded AGRA as the largest philanthropic foundation in the world and was generously financed by various other organisations and countries where projects were implemented, AGRA did not meet its creators' expectations. As we will see below, it further worsened farmers' status and increased poverty and hunger in most states where AGRA policies were implemented.

Failure to increase yield

In its agricultural policies, AGRA has mainly focused on technical measures used to increase crop yields (especially cereals and pulses), primarily through the development and dissemination of 'improved' seed varieties, as AGRA believes that the fundamental problem of African agriculture is low yields. Furthermore, AGRA attributes the low yields achieved by African smallholder farmers to i) lack of scientific knowledge and capacity, ii) lack of public and private investment in African agriculture, iii) poor and depleted soils, iv) limited seed development systems that prevent the introduction of new varieties, and, v) weak governance and regulatory systems. If these shortcomings were to be removed, there would be no obstacle to an exceptional increase in yields, and in this way, small African farmers would be lifted out of poverty. AGRA's obsession with increasing yield is captured in the following passage from the 2017 annual report: "Our goal is to contribute to doubling the yields and incomes of 30 million smallholder households across the continent. That's a significant number in itself, but the indirect impact will be much larger. We hope that by demonstrating the possibilities of a smallholder farmer-centered, African-led, partnership-driven African agriculture, AGRA will help catalyze investments that reach hundreds of millions of people."[24] According to AGRA agricultural production is low among African countries because they do not use fertiliser and other potent technologies. The need to increase

24 Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA). *Strategy Overview for 2017-2021 Inclusive Agricultural Transformation in Africa*, https://agra.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/AGRA-Corporate-Strategy-Doc-3.-2.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

the use of fertilisers to increase yields is reiterated in the 2014 report, which states that AGRA "strives to establish or support institutions around the things that farmers need to be able to farm productively; be it better organization, input systems including seed and fertilizer businesses."[25] It is no surprise that AGRA has failed to achieve its stated goals of doubling yields by 2020, best proven by a scientific study with the illustrative title "False Promises: Alliance for Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA)"[26], published in July 2020. Five non-governmental organisations from Germany are preparing the study, and five from Mali, Kenya, Tanzania and Zambia (countries included in AGRA programs) participated. The study was made based on the research of Prof. Timothy Wise and his team from Tufts University in the USA. It is important to emphasise that this study is the first independent analysis of AGRA's results. The study results show that agricultural yields in the 13 AGRA focus countries increased by only 18%, rather than doubling, from the start of their programs in 2006 to 2018. However, it is crucial to understand that before AGRA, yields in 13 countries in AGRA's focus gradually increased by 17%, even without programs. Therefore, yield increases 'without' AGRA and 's' AGRA are almost identical. A detailed analysis of AGRA evaluations confirms that yields remain relatively low when small farmers combine hybrid seeds and artificial fertilisers. Despite the increased use of commercial hybrid seeds and artificial fertilisers, even corn, as AGRA's most promoted field crop, did not yield more than three tons per hectare in any country, which is significantly less than, for example, the yield in Croatia of 6.13 per hectare,[27] or Serbia, which has an average corn yield of 4.5 tons per hectare.[28] On the other hand, for example, in Ghana, farmers who participated in AGRA projects have a relatively large amount of arable land (3.5 ha per aver-

25 Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA). *Positioning for Rapid Progress*, https://agra.org/AGRAOld/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/annual-report-2014-positioning-for-rapid-progress.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

26 Mkindi, A., Maina, A., Urhahn, J. et al. 2020. *False Promises: The Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA)*, https://www.rosalux.de/fileadmin/rls_uploads/pdfs/Studien/False_Promises_AGRA_en.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

27 Maize yield for Croatia and Serbia was taken from the Our World in data website: Ourworldindata.org, *Corn yields* 2023, https://ourworldindata.org/grapher/maize-yields?tab=chart&region=Europe&country=~HRV, accessed: August 3, 2024.

28 Ourworldindata.org, *Corn yields* 2023, https://ourworldindata.org/grapher/maize-yields?tab=chart&region=Europe&country=~SRB, accessed: August 3, 2024.

age). In addition, the level of applied technology was relatively high, with 31 kg of artificial fertiliser used per year per hectare. It should be noted that AGRA mainly supports 'emerging' farmers in Ghana, not small food producers, whose initiative claims to reach those who own much less land. Despite this favourable starting point, average corn yields were only 0.58 tons per hectare.[29] Moreover, other independent studies show that the increased corn yield is often not worth the actual price of artificial fertiliser without the subsidy, and importantly to emphasise that the significant public investment in fertiliser subsidies since 2006 (the year of AGRA's founding) has not generated a significant and sustained increase in yield, especially bearing in mind the fact that according to the data, states subsidised inputs in agricultural production for about 1 billion dollars per year, while at the same time grants of 40-50 million dollars were approved by AGRA in the states included in the program.[30] It turns out that the domicile countries subsidised farmers in their countries more than 20 times more compared to AGRA and Gates Foundations. However, at the same time, the public gets the impression that Bill Gates personally paid subsidies to small farmers in Africa. Already, the most considerable increase in production came from the expansion of arable land, and land degradation, deterioration of soil health and the consequences of climate change continue to negatively affect the food security of small-scale food producers negatively, making the expensive procurement of hybrid seeds and fertilisers very risky.[31] The assessment for Burkina Faso shows that the yield of corn has not grown in the last decade, although farmers of-

29 rosalux.de, *A Sting in AGRA Tale: Independent expert evaluations confirm that the Alliance for a Green Revolution has failed*, https://www.rosalux.de/fileadmin/rls_uploads/pdfs/engl/AGRA_Sting_in_the_AGRA_Tale_ENG_20210721.pdfaccessed: August 3, 2024.

30 Jayne TS, Rashid S. Input subsidy programs in Sub-Saharan Africa: A synthesis of recent evidence. *Agricultural Economics*, (2013) 44:547–62. https://doi.org/10.1111/agec.12073

31 Fearon, J. et al., „Fertilizer Subsidy Programme in Ghana: Evidence of Performance after Six Years of Implementation", *Journal of Biology*, Vol. 5, No. 21, 2015, 100-107 p. https://iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JBAH/article/view/27076/27758, accessed: August 3, 2024.

ten grow corn varieties recommended by AGRA.[32] Moreover, according to Prof. Wise AGRA's research, the expected yield did not increase, as seen in the following examples. Nigeria, the largest corn producer among AGRA countries, saw a 7% increase in yields under AGRA, less than 0.5% per year, compared to 2.5% annual yield growth before AGRA. Kenya, the fourth largest corn producer, saw yields decline under AGRA after posting 1.7% average annual yield growth nine years before AGRA's arrival. Tanzania, the third largest corn producer, also showed tepid yield growth of just 15%, barely more than 1.0% per year. Zambia, AGRA's sixth largest corn producer, posted just a 27% increase in corn yields, an annual average of 2%; yield growth before AGRA was much higher, 4.2% per year.[33]

Failure to reduce poverty and hunger

As seen in the previous chapter, the AGRA plan to double yields, a prerequisite for reducing poverty and hunger, was not fulfilled. AGRA's results are even worse in reducing poverty and hunger. In the mentioned period, small farmers did not escape poverty, but many fell into debt due to expensive inputs (expensive hybrid seeds and artificial fertilisers). According to AGRA's own narrative, by using more inputs, small-scale farmers will double their crop yields, which should lead to a doubling of incomes. AGRA's evaluations show that revenues from selling its main crop, corn, are meagre. In Tanzania, for example, evaluators estimated the additional revenue generated by AGRA-supported activities from corn sales at US $ 77 per household per year.[34] However, they could not claim that AGRA-supported activities generated any of it. However, the increased outlay for fertiliser, seed and pesticides was not offset, leaving the question of net additional income unan-

32 KIT/AGRA, *Burkina Faso Outcome Monitoring Report 2019, AGRA-PIATA Programme*, https://agra.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/AGRA-OM-Report_FINAL.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

33 Wise, T. A., *Africa's choice: Africa's green revolution has failed, time to change course*, https://www.iatp.org/sites/default/files/2020-07/2020_07_AfricasChoice_PolicyBrief.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

34 KIT/AGRA, *PIATA 2019 Outcome Monitoring Report AGRA Tanzania*, https://agra.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/AGRA-OM-Tanzania-Report_FINAL.pdf. accessed: August 3, 2024.

swered—it cannot be ruled out that the balance may even be negative. The official Tanzanian poverty line is US $ 250 per person per year, or about US $ 500 for a household of two adults. The average small farmer earns just 15.4% of the income needed to reach the Tanzanian poverty line by selling a corn crop. On average, a household in Tanzania has five members, including children, which illustrates how low the income generated by AGRA is. Of particular concern is the increase in the number of hungry people in the countries included in the AGRA program. The results are shocking. According to reports, the total number of undernourished in AGRA's 13 countries has increased from 100.5 million to 131.3 million, a 30% increase from the period before AGRA to 2018. Only Ethiopia reports a significant decline in the absolute number of severely undernourished citizens.[35] Nigeria and Uganda account for a large share of the increase in undernourishment, with the number more than doubling in each country over the AGRA's 12-year period.[36] Even the evaluation of AGRA's activities published in 2022, made by AGRA and financed by the Gates Foundation, despite the shortcomings, because instead of evaluating the effects in all AGRA countries, data from only a few countries was processed, admits that the results are not in line with the promises. For example, reports state that the increase in the income of small farmers and, consequently, the exit from poverty "likely reflect remaining farmer constraints in access to affordable inputs and output markets, as well as low per-farmer investment levels. These findings suggest that AGRA did not meet its headline goal of increased incomes and food security for 9 million smallholders despite reaching over 10 million smallholders."[37]

35 Wise, T. A., *Africa's choice: Africa's green revolution has failed, time to change course*, https://www.iatp.org/sites/default/files/2020-07/2020_07_AfricasChoice_PolicyBrief.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

36 Wise, T. A., *Failing Africa's Farmers: An Impact Assessment of the Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa*. Working Paper No. 20-01. Global Development and Environment Institute. https://sites.tufts.edu/gdae/files/2020/07/20-01_Wise_FailureToYield.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

37 Blair, R. et al., *Partnership for Inclusive Agricultural Transformation in Africa, Final Evaluation Volume I – Final Evaluation Report*, https://agra.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/PIATA-Final-Evaluation-Report-Volume-I.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Promotion of genetically modified crops in African agriculture

From the beginning, the Gates Foundation was strongly marked by the ethos of Bill Gates, which can be described most simply by techno-optimism. According to Bill Gates, every problem facing today's society is a problem that can be solved with the help of technology and science. Bill Gates' approach is also visible in the activities of the Gates Foundation. For example, how to solve the problem of insufficient health care and high mortality from diseases in developing countries, according to Bill Gates, you need to invest money in the production and distribution of vaccines and thus reduce mortality and improve the health situation in the world's poorest countries. Although vaccines have an unquestionable public health value, they are not a complete healthcare solution; they are only a tiny part of the healthcare that needs to be built in developing countries. Since the systematic construction of comprehensive health care is too expensive and too slow for Bill Gates, it is easier to promote vaccination as the fastest and simplest method of health care. Bill Gates applies a similar principle regarding food production in developing countries. Why respect traditional knowledge and skills in combination with agroecology when a ready-made solution can be imposed through genetically modified seeds protected by patent rights? His advocacy for GMO crops was grounded in the belief that these technologies could address some of the most pressing issues in agriculture, such as pest resistance, drought tolerance, and nutrient deficiencies in staple crops. He argued that GMOs could be critical in increasing food production in regions with poor soil, limited water, and other challenges exacerbated by climate change. In the following, through the analysis of Bill Gates' statements and projects funded by the Gates Foundation, we will show that the critics of AGRA are right when they claim Bill Gates' plan through AGRA to introduce genetically modified crops into African agriculture.[38]

Bill Gates began advocating for GMOs in the early 2010s when the debate over genetically modified crops became increasingly polarised. Bill Gates made one of his clearest endorsements of GMO crops during

38 Dano, E. D., *Unmasking the Green Revolution in Africa: motives, players and dynamics*, https://www.rural21.com/fileadmin/_migrated/content_uploads/R21_Unmasking_the_Green_Revolution_in_Africa...0408.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

a speech at the World Food Prize ceremony in 2010. In his speech, he stated that "we should use every tool at our disposal, including genetically modified seeds." He argued that biotechnology could help address the challenges faced by smallholder farmers in Africa and other developing regions by providing crops that are more resilient to environmental stressors and capable of delivering higher yields.[39] This endorsement of GMO crops was controversial, drawing criticism from some environmental and advocacy groups who argued that GMOs could lead to increased corporate control over seeds and farming, potentially exacerbating inequality and dependency among smallholder farmers.[40] Bill Gates has consistently defended using GMOs in agriculture, often citing their benefits in increasing crop yields and reducing the need for chemical pesticides. For instance, on his blog, Gates Notes, he argued that GMOs are "perfectly healthy" and lamented the public's scepticism toward the technology. He highlighted the potential of GMO crops to address hunger and malnutrition in regions where traditional farming methods fall short due to poor soil quality, drought, and other environmental challenges.[41] Furthermore, Bill Gates explained his support for genetic engineering in an interview for the Wall Street Journal: "What are called GMOs are done by changing the genes of the plant, and it's done in a way where there's a very thorough safety procedure, and it's pretty incredible because it reduces the amount of pesticide you need, raises productivity (and) can help with malnutrition by getting vitamin fortification. And so I think, for Africa, this is going to make a huge difference, particularly as they face climate change... The US, China, Brazil, are using these things and if you want farmers in Africa to improve nutrition and be competitive on the world market, you know, as long as the right safety things are done, that's really beneficial. It's kind of a second round of the green revolution. And so the Africans I think will choose to let their people have

39 worldfoodprize.org, *The 2009 Borlaug Dialogue: Food, Agriculture, and National Security in a Globalized World*, https://www.worldfoodprize.org/documents/filelibrary/documents/09highlights_358E5A8062AC9.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

40 Philpott, T., *Bill Gates reveals support for GMO ag*, https://grist.org/food-and-agriculture/2009-10-21-bill-gates-reveals-support-for-gmo-ag/, accessed: August 3, 2024.

41 gatesnotes.com, *A Conversation with Bill Gates: GMOs*, https://www.gatesnotes.com/A-Conversation-with-Bill-Gates-GMOs, accessed: August 3, 2024.

enough to eat."[42] We will conclude this section with probably the most controversial statement Bill Gates made in a speech at the University of Nairobi in November 2022 when he declared: "Every piece of the breed I have ever eaten is... GMO wheat."[43] According to all research, no GMO wheat is commercially grown in the US or elsewhere because food processors in Europe and the US know consumers' reactions to genetically modified wheat products. Now, the logical question arises whether Bill Gates has been growing his own genetically modified wheat since childhood or lied to the public in Kenya. To what end did Gates, one of the world's wealthiest, lie brazenly in public?

The Gates Foundation caused a major public controversy when it was revealed that it had purchased 500,000 shares of Monsanto, which is notorious for its aggressive promotion of GMO crops. According to critics: "Monsanto has a history of blatant disregard for the interests and well being of small farmers around the world… [This] casts serious doubt on the foundation's heavy funding of agricultural development in Africa."[44]

The Gates Foundation has played a pivotal role in promoting GMOs by funding and supporting various agricultural initiatives. The foundation has invested in research and development of genetically modified crops tailored to the specific needs of farmers in developing countries. For example, the foundation has funded projects to develop drought-resistant corn and pest-resistant cowpea, critical staples in many African countries. According to the Friend of the Earth report, an analysis of the Gates Foundation grants database found that between 2005 and 2011, the Gates Foundation spent US$162 million on projects that included genetic modification (GM) technologies, such as drought-tolerant corn, corn with improved nitrogen efficiency, crops with increased

42 Blumenstein, R., *Bill Gates: GMOs Will End Starvation in Africa*, https://www.wsj.com/video/bill-gates-gmos-will-end-starvation-in-africa/3085A8D1-BB58-4CAA-9394-E567033434A4?mod=e2fb&fbclid=IwY2xjawEmwEJleHRuA2FlbQIxMQABHYieVJslGmwkIp5O6kSqvt3jm-7uRSj4NF0p9k3S86Oftd7p7UvmYgbTCA_aem_548dW8yyQZqJYkY_WzljYg, accessed: August 3, 2024.

43 Gates, B., *Every piece of the breed I have ever eaten is from genetically modified wheat*, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XFKJn1o4AVw, accessed: August 3, 2024.

44 Vidal, J., *Why is the Gates foundation investing in GM giant Monsanto?* The Guardian 29. September 2010, https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/poverty-matters/2010/sep/29/gates-foundation-gm-monsanto, accessed: August 3, 2024.

levels of specific nutrients, disease-resistant cassava and wheat, and rice with altered photosynthesis.[45] One of the notable projects supported by the Gates Foundation is the Water Efficient Maize for Africa (WEMA) initiative. This program, launched in collaboration with the African Agricultural Technology Foundation (AATF), focuses on developing maize varieties that are both drought-tolerant and insect-resistant, utilising genetic modification techniques. According to AATF and AGRA, WEMA aims to provide smallholder farmers in sub-Saharan Africa access to seeds that can thrive under challenging environmental conditions, improving food security and farmer incomes. In reality, the situation is far from the truth. Although the WEMA project started in 2008, only two years after the founding of AGRA, in 2024, 16 years later, it did not come to life. From the beginning, the WEMA project has caused resistance from non-governmental organisations,[46] independent scientists, and small farmers across Africa because of the desire to make money through the imposition of GMO crops under the guise of philanthropy.[47] The importance of WEMA to the Bill Gates and Gates Foundation is shown by the fact that the Gates Foundation has until 2015 85 million USD in funding for the WEMA project. It has also put around US$720 million into the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (of which CIMMYT is a member) and nearly US$ 100 million into the AATF.[48]

45 Friends of the Earth International, *A Wolf in Sheep's Clothing? An analysis of the 'sustainable intensification' of agriculture*, https://www.foei.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Wolf-in-Sheeps-Clothing-for-web.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

46 African Centre for Biodiversity, *WEMA project shrouded in secrecy: open letter to African governments to be accountable to farmers, civil society*, https://grain.org/en/article/5792-wema-project-shrouded-in-secrecy-open-letter-to-african-governments-to-be-accountable-to-farmers-civil-society, accessed: August 3, 2024.

47 African Centre for Biodiversity, *The Water Efficient Maize For Africa (WEMA) project—profiteering not philanthropy!* https://acbio.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/WEMA-Discussion-Doc-web.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

48 African Centre for Biodiversity, *Profiting from the climate crisis, undermining resilience in Africa: Gates and Monsanto's Water Efficient Maize for Africa (WEMA) Project*, https://www.brot-fuer-die-welt.de/fileadmin/mediapool/2_Downloads/Fachinformationen/Sonstiges/ACB-WEMA-Studie.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Influence on national agricultural policies

The Gates Foundation's substantial financial contributions and strategic influence in AGRA significantly affect national agricultural policies across Africa. This influence can shape policy decisions, prioritising technological solutions over more holistic, community-based approaches. According to critics, centralising decision-making power in a few large philanthropic organisations raises ethical questions about democratic governance, accountability, and potential conflicts of interest between public welfare and private philanthropic agendas.[49] According to its own evaluation report, AGRA's influence on policy reforms favouring the Green Revolution initiatives in its focus countries impressed the evaluators the most. The evaluation report shows how AGRA systematically influences African governments to change agricultural legislation in an industry-friendly way. Its methods include sending staff to ministries or ministries and government advisory bodies receiving direct financial support from AGRA. Due to such financial engagement, the evaluations reveal that AGRA influences legislation or regulation, actively affecting the political decision-making processes of sovereign states whose task is to draft and enact laws. AGRA has also funded master's and PhD degrees for staff who then return to ministries and advance the AGRA agenda and narrative.[50] AGRA has worked on new seed and fertiliser laws in all AGRA countries (except Mali). One main goal is to simplify the licensing and marketing of synthetic fertilisers, like terminating government controls, such as fertiliser approval in Tanzania, or placing these controls in the hands of agro corporations. In the seed sector, AGRA supported and financed several projects with governments and other state institutions to change seed policies and regulations favouring seeds adapted to industrial agriculture. For example, the private sector in Tanzania can now access seeds

49 McGoey L. *No such thing as a free gift*, London, Verso, 2015.

50 rosalux.de, *A Sting in AGRA Tale: Independent expert evaluations confirm that the Alliance for a Green Revolution has failed*, https://www.rosalux.de/fileadmin/rls_uploads/pdfs/engl/AGRA_Sting_in_the_AGRA_Tale_ENG_20210721.pdfaccessed: August 3, 2024.

generated by public breeding.[51] AGRA directly financed government agencies that worked on seven of the eight policy reforms in Ghana alone—four specifically in seed and artificial fertiliser. It also developed legislative proposals in the interests of the private sector rather than further those of small-scale food producers.[52] In Ethiopia, AGRA also managed to ensure the elimination of import tariffs and domestic taxes on pesticides.[53]AGRA's policies often undermine crop diversity and locality dietary diversity while increasing farmers' dependence on expensive and climate-damaging external inputs from the agricultural industry. We will conclude this chapter by announcing a more sinister plan for smallholder farmers in Africa. Currently, the effort by philanthropists and agribusiness companies through the activities of AGRA to implement policies in Africa that criminalise seed saving is at work, as Alexander Zaitchik writes in his article: "This past summer, the global trade regime finalized details for a revolution in African agriculture... Based on draft laws written more than three decades ago in Geneva by Western seed companies, the new generation of agricultural reforms seeks to institute legal and financial penalties throughout the African Union for farmers who fail to adopt foreign-engineered seeds protected by patents, including genetically modified versions of native seeds. The resulting seed economy would transform African farming into a bonanza for global agribusiness, promote export-oriented monocultures, and undermine resilience during a time of deepening climate disruption. The most direct beneficiaries of this plan", Zaitchik wrote, are "a four-company oligopoly that controls half the global seed market and 75 percent of the global agricultural chemicals market: Bayer (formerly Monsanto), Corteva (formerly DowDuPont), BASF, and Syngenta, a subsidiary of ChemChina."[54]

51 Percy, R.; Sibanda, E.; Ticehurst, D. and Davies, G., *Evaluation Report. Midterm evaluation of AGRA's 2017–2021 strategy implementation*, https://agra.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/AGRA-MTE-report-final-27.01.20.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

52 Ibid.

53 Ibid.

54 Zaitchik, A. The New Colonialist Food Economy, *The Nation*, 18 September 2023. https://www.thenation.com/article/world/new-colonialist-food-economy/, accessed: August 3, 2024.

CONCLUSION

We will start our concluding remarks with words from Jan Urhahn, head of the Food Sovereignty Program at the Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung in Johannesburg, South Africa: "The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation is pushing an agribusiness model on Africa that has failed. Rather than relieving the ongoing hunger crisis, it has undercut Africans' ability to solve their own problems, free of do-gooder philanthropists."[55]As seen in the paper, 18 years after its foundation, AGRA has not fulfilled the expectations and the great promises that were made. Moreover, according to the available data that we analysed, the situation is much worse today since, in AGRA countries, the level of undernourished people has increased by 30 per cent. Our analysis showed that the Gates Foundation's activities within AGRA are inherently anti-democratic and paternalistic, as Tim Schwab brilliantly writes in his article: "Gates isn't interested in empowering the poor; he's interested in imposing his solutions. Following the money from the Gates Foundation confirms this. Nearly 90 percent of the foundation's charitable dollars go to organizations located in wealthy nations, not the poor countries he claims to serve. Never mind that the Gates Foundation's website is inundated with the images of smiling poor people of color; in practice, the Gates model is funding white-collared bodies in the Global North to fix those wearing dashikis, burqas, saris, and kangas in the Global South."[56] Philanthrocapitalists like Bill Gates and philanthrocapitalism should be the subject of bioethical analyses precisely because of the public narrative that the problems of today's society can only be solved by good billionaires like Bill Gates and others. Why allow African farmers to apply their knowledge and local seeds combined with new scientific knowledge from agriculture and ecology in agroecology to solve the problem of producing enough food when the solution can be left to techno managers like Bill Gates and hope everything will be okay? Unfortunately, it turned out that the techno-fix solutions that

55 Urhahn, J., *Rich Philanthropists Don't Have the Solutions to Africa's Hunger Crisis*, https://jacobin.com/2023/09/africa-hunger-crisis-bill-gates-philanthropy-green-revolution-agriculture-farmers, accessed: August 3, 2024.

56 Schwab, T., Why Bill Gates's Philantrophy Is a Problem, *The Nation*, 22 November 2023. https://www.thenation.com/article/society/bill-gates-philanthropy-misanthropy/, accessed: August 3, 2024.

are offered are not only insufficient but ultimately harmful, as can be seen in the paper. This is exactly why we need bioethics, since bioethics as a science of life and respect for the value of life as a whole, among other things, addresses the problems of the public sphere and the influence of human activity on public institutions. Bioethics as a science needs to problematise the relationships of power created within the society that lead to inequality; bioethics should point to such problems and ultimately try to offer solutions to issues of non-democratic practices such as philanthrocapitalists' philanthropic practices. Therefore, we conclude that as long as there is inequality in society, which philanthrocapitalists unsuccessfully attempt to remove, like Bill Gates in the case of AGRA and African agriculture. Philanthrocapitalists endeavour that their philanthropic activity does not eliminate the causes of inequality (read neoliberal capitalist system); there will be a need for bioethical criticism of philanthropic activity. To some extent, it is obvious that philanthropic activity serves to preserve the existing status quo in which philanthrocapitalists remain at the top of the global power pyramid. Ultimately, Tim Schwab reminds us what philanthropy means and why Bill Gates' activities in Africa are a bioethical issue: "The word 'philanthropy,' from the Greek, means lover of humanity. A charitable gift is meant to be an act of love, not an exercise of power. Giving away money is not supposed to magnify the asymmetries in power that govern society but to collapse them. And this is why, in many respects, Gates might be better described as a misanthrope—if he does not hate his fellow human, then he certainly views himself as superior. Gates's disregard for the wishes, needs, rights, dignity, intelligence, and talent of the poor people that he claims to be serving speaks to the fundamentally colonial lens through which he executes his charitable empire. It highlights the existential limits of what he can accomplish and explains why the Gates Foundation has achieved so little. At some point, we should understand that humanitarianism aimed at real human progress—equality, justice, freedom—requires us to challenge unaccountable power and illegitimate leaders, not worship them. And that means Bill Gates is a problem, not a solution."[57]

57 Ibid.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

African Centre for Biodiversity, *Profiting from the climate crisis, undermining resilience in Africa: Gates and Monsanto's Water Efficient Maize for Africa (WEMA) Project*, https://www.brot-fuer-die-welt.de/fileadmin/mediapool/2_Downloads/Fachinformationen/Sonstiges/ACB-WEMA-Studie.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

African Centre for Biodiversity, *The Water Efficient Maize For Africa (WEMA) project—profiteering not philanthropy!* https://acbio.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/WEMA-Discussion-Doc-web.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

African Centre for Biodiversity, *WEMA project shrouded in secrecy: open letter to African governments to be accountable to farmers, civil society*, https://grain.org/en/article/5792-wema-project-shrouded-in-secrecy-open-letter-to-african-governments-to-be-accountable-to-farmers-civil-society, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA). *Positioning for Rapid Progress*, https://agra.org/AGRAOld/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/annual-report-2014-positioning-for-rapid-progress.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA). *Strategy Overview for 2017-2021 Inclusive Agricultural Transformation in Africa*, https://agra.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/AGRA-Corporate-Strategy-Doc-3.-2.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA). *Building on the New Momentum in African Agriculture. AGRA in 2008*., https://agra.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/agra-annual-report-2008.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024

Bassey, M. 2012. AGRA's *Technology Push in Africa*. https://www.foei.org/resources/publications/publications-bysubject/food-sovereignty-publications/agras-technology-push-in-africa, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Belay, M. & Wise, T.A. 2019. The Battle for the Future of Food in Africa. *Common Dreams.* https://www.commondreams.org/views/2019/11/01/battle-futurefood-africa, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Belay, M. & Mugambe, B. 2021. Bill Gates Should Stop Telling Africans What Kind of Agriculture Africans Need. *Scientific American.* https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/bill-gates-should-stop-telling-africans-what-kind-of-agricultureafricans-need1/, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, *2009 World Food Prize Symposium*, https://www.gatesfoundation.org/ideas/speeches/2009/10/bill-gates-2009-world-food-prize-symposium, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, *Helping Poor Farmers, Changes Needed to Feed 1 Billion Hungry*, https://www.gatesfoundation.org/ideas/media-center/press-releases/2012/02/helping-poor-farmers-changes-needed-to-feed-1-billion-hungry, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, *Who we are*, https://www.gatesfoundation.org/Who-We-Are/General-Information/Foundation-Factsheet, accessed: August 3, 2024)

Bishop, M., Green, M. *Philanthrocapitalism: How the Rich Can Save The World*, New York, Bloomsbury Press, 2008.

Blair, R. et al., *Partnership for Inclusive Agricultural Transformation in Africa, Final Evaluation Volume I – Final Evaluation Report*, https://agra.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/PIATA-Final-Evaluation-Report-Volume-I.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Blumenstein, R., *Bill Gates: GMOs Will End Starvation in Africa*, https://www.wsj.com/video/bill-gates-gmos-will-end-starvation-in-africa/3085A8D1-BB58-4CAA-9394-E567033434A4?mod=e2fb&fbclid=IwY2xjawEmwEJleHRuA2FlbQIxMQABHYieVJslGmwkIp5O6kSqvt3jm-7uRSj4NF0p9k3S86Oftd7p7UvmYgbTCA_aem_548dW8yyQZqJYkY_WzljYg, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Dano, E. D., *Unmasking the Green Revolution in Africa: motives, players and dynamics*, https://www.rural21.com/fileadmin/_migrated/content_uploads/R21_Unmasking_the_Green_Revolution_in_Africa...0408.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Holt-Giménez, E. & Altieri, M.A. 2012. Agroecology, Food Sovereignty, and the NewGreen Revolution. *Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems*. 37(1):90-102.

Fearon, J. et al., „Fertilizer Subsidy Programme in Ghana: Evidence of Performance after Six Years of Implementation", *Journal of Biology*, Vol.5, No.21, 2015, 100-107 p. https://iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JBAH/article/view/27076/27758, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Friends of the Earth International, *A Wolf in Sheep's Clothing? An analysis of the 'sustainable intensification' of agriculture*, https://www.foei.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Wolf-in-Sheeps-Clothing-for-web.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Gates, B., *Every piece of the breed I have ever eaten is from genetically modified wheat*, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XFKJn1o4AVw, accessed: August 3, 2024.

gatesnotes.com, *A Conversation with Bill Gates: GMOs*, https://www.gatesnotes.com/A-Conversation-with-Bill-Gates-GMOs, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Grain, *Another silver bullet for Africa?*, https://grain.org/en/article/160-another-silver-bullet-for-africa, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Ignatova, J. A. 2017. The 'philanthropic' gene: Biocapital and the new green revolution in Africa. *The Third World Quarterly*. 38(10):2258-2275.

Jayne TS, Rashid S. Input subsidy programs in Sub-Saharan Africa: A synthesis of recent evidence. *Agricultural Economics*, (2013) 44:547–62. https://doi.org/10.1111/agec.12073

KIT/AGRA, *Burkina Faso Outcome Monitoring Report 2019, AGRA-PIATA Programme*, https://agra.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/AGRA-OM-Report_FINAL.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

KIT/AGRA, *PIATA 2019 Outcome Monitoring Report AGRA Tanzania*, https://agra.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/AGRA-OM-Tanzania-Report_FINAL.pdf. accessed: August 3, 2024.

McGoey L. No such thing as a free gift, London, Verso, 2015.

Mkindi, A., Maina, A., Urhahn, J. et al. 2020. *False Promises: The Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA)*, https://www.rosalux.de/fileadmin/rls_uploads/pdfs/Studien/False_Promises_AGRA_en.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Ourworldindata.org, *Corn yields* 2023, https://ourworldindata.org/grapher/maize-yields?tab=chart&region=Europe&country=~HRV, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Ourworldindata.org, *Corn yields* 2023, https://ourworldindata.org/grapher/maize-yields?tab=chart&region=Europe&country=~SRB, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Patel, R. The Long Green Revolution. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*. 2013, 40(1): 1-63.

Percy, R.; Sibanda, E.; Ticehurst, D. and Davies, G., *Evaluation Report. Midterm evaluation of AGRA's 2017–2021 strategy implementation*, https://agra.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/AGRA-MTE-report-final-27.01.20.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Philpott, T., *Bill Gates reveals support for GMO ag*, https://grist.org/food-and-agriculture/2009-10-21-bill-gates-reveals-support-for-gmo-ag/, accessed: August 3, 2024.

rosalux.de, *A Sting in AGRA Tale: Independent expert evaluations confirm that the Alliance for a Green Revolution has failed*,

https://www.rosalux.de/fileadmin/rls_uploads/pdfs/engl/AGRA_Sting_in_the_AGRA_Tale_ENG_20210721.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Schwab, T., Why Bill Gates's Philantrophy Is a Problem, *The Nation*, 22 November 2023. https://www.thenation.com/article/society/bill-gates-philanthropy-misanthropy/, accessed: August 3, 2024.

The African Centre for Biosafety, *Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA): Laying the groundwork for the commercialisation of African Agriculture*, https://acbio.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/AGRA_critique.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Toenniessen, G., Adesina, A. & de Vries, J., Building an Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*. 2008, 1136(1):233-242.

Urhahn, J., *Rich Philanthropists Don't Have the Solutions to Africa's Hunger Crisis*, https://jacobin.com/2023/09/africa-hunger-crisis-bill-gates-philanthropy-green-revolution-agriculture-farmers, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Vidal, J., *Why is the Gates foundation investing in GM giant Monsanto?* The Guardian 29. September 2010, https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/poverty-matters/2010/sep/29/gates-foundation-gm-monsanto, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Wise, T. A., *Africa's choice: Africa's green revolution has failed, time to change course*, https://www.iatp.org/sites/default/files/2020-07/2020_07_AfricasChoice_PolicyBrief.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Wise, T. A. 2020. *Failing Africa's Farmers: An Impact Assessment of the Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa*. Working Paper No. 20-01. Global Development and Environment Institute. https://sites.tufts.edu/gdae/files/2020/07/20-01_Wise_FailureToYield.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Wise, T. A., *Africa's choice: Africa's green revolution has failed, time to change course*, https://www.iatp.org/sites/default/files/2020-07/2020_07_AfricasChoice_PolicyBrief.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Wise, T. A. 2021. *AGRA Update: Withheld internal documents reveal no progress for Africa's farmers.* https://www.iatp.org/blog/202102/agra-update-withheld-internal-documents-revealno-progress-africas-farmers, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Wise, T. A. 2021. *New AGRA Reports Offer Little Evidence to Justify Continued Donor Support.* https://www.iatp.org/documents/new-agra-reports-offer-little-evidence-justifycontinued-donor-support, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Wise, T. A. 2020. *Pressure builds on Gates Foundation, AGRA for accountability.* https://www.iatp.org/blog/202010/pressure-builds-gates-foundation-agra-accountability, accessed: August 3, 2024.

worldfoodprize.org, *The 2009 Borlaug Dialogue: Food, Agriculture, and National Security in a Globalized World*, https://www.worldfoodprize.org/documents/filelibrary/documents/09highlights_358E5A8062AC9.pdf, accessed: August 3, 2024.

Zaitchik, A. The New Colonialist Food Economy, *The Nation*, 18 September 2023. https://www.thenation.com/article/world/new-colonialist-food-economy/, accessed: August 3, 2024.

IVICA KELAM
Sveučilište Josipa Jurja Strossmayera u Osijeku, Fakultet za odgojne i obrazovne znanosti/Fakultet za dentalnu medicinu i zdravstvo, Hrvatska

BIOETIČKI ASPEKTI FILANTROKAPITALIZMA U POLJOPRIVREDI

Sažetak: Ovaj rad istražuje bioetičke aspekte filantrokapitalizma u poljoprivredi, fokusirajući se na aktivnosti Gejtsove fondacije u Savezu za zelenu revoluciju u Africi (AGRA – Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa). Fondacija je igrala centralnu ulogu u misiji AGRA-e da transformiše afričku poljoprivredu podstičući moderne tehnike i inpute, kao što su genetski modifikovana semena i sintetička đubriva. Zagovornici tvrde da bi ta inicijativa mogla značajno unaprediti proizvodnju i bezbednost hrane u Africi. Kritičari, međutim, u prvi plan postavljaju bioetička pitanja, uključujući stvaranje zavisnosti od spoljnjih poljoprivrednih inputa, marginalizaciju malih poljoprivrednika, izmeštanje tradicionalnih poljoprivrednih praksi, promociju genetski modifikovanih useva, kao i značajan uticaj Fondacije na državnu poljoprivrednu politiku. Ovaj rad analiziraće ta bioetička pitanja i vrednovaće njihove implikacije po afričke poljoprivrednike, lokalne zajednice i prehrambeni suverenitet. Naglasiće ključnu potrebu za inkluzivnim, transparentnim i pravednim pristupom poljoprivrednom razvoju, što će poštovati lokalno znanje i davati prvenstvo održivim i ekološkim poljoprivrednim praksama, jer je to suštinski važno za etički napredak poljoprivrede.
Ključne reči: bioetika, Bil Gejts, Gejts fondacija, AGRA, poljoprivreda

Primljeno: 13.8.2024.
Prihvaćeno: 15.10.2024.