

British goad U.S. Congress toward sanctions on Sudan

by Muriel Mirak Weissbach

Whether or not the honorable members of the United States Congress know it, that institution is about to be turned into a towel boy for the British foreign policy establishment. Legislation is reportedly being prepared by Rep. Donald Payne (D-N.J.), to call for imposing sanctions against the African nation of Sudan, conforming to the precise demands articulated by House of Lords Deputy Speaker Baroness Caroline Cox, who has been leading the charge against Sudan for London.

In her capacity as international president of the British intelligence front Christian Solidarity International (CSI), Cox has campaigned for sanctions to be imposed, through the mechanism of the United Nations Security Council. In January, under British chairmanship, the Security Council passed a resolution condemning Sudan for alleged harboring of terrorists, suspects wanted in connection with the assassination attempt against Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak in summer 1995. But, when the case came up for review in April, and tougher sanctions were on the agenda, neither Egypt, the most crucial regional player, nor China and Russia, both members of the permanent five, were very enthusiastic. The Egyptian government had grasped the dangers involved for the country, were UN sanctions to lead to total destabilization of the Khartoum government, and a dismembering of the nation. The result was a resolution imposing diplomatic sanctions only.

As the next Security Council session comes up on July 10, the prospects that the British may succeed in adding to these political measures, a full-scale embargo on weapons, oil, foreign trade in general, and aviation, would seem to be dim. Relations between Khartoum and Egypt, which the British have labored to poison, have not deteriorated, but rather improved consistently; at the summit of Arab heads of state held in Cairo on June 22-23, in fact, Sudanese President

Gen. Omar Hassan Al-Bashir met with Egyptian President Mubarak, paving the way for full reconciliation. The process toward reconciliation had been prepared by a series of meetings at the ministerial level, and, in the wake of the Cairo encounter, was followed up by contacts to discuss security coordination. China, which had a high-level delegation in Khartoum in late June, made known it would not fuel the assault against Sudan. A senior Chinese politician told Sudanese Minister of State Gabriel Roric, that China was committed to support Sudan politically in the international forum. As for Russia, it, too, has good economic reasons for maintaining good relations with Africa's largest nation. On June 25, the Sudanese government officially opened the "Higlieg 4" oil well, which started pumping 10,000 barrels per day. A road has been opened to transport the oil from nearby Muglad to El Obeid, and thence, to Port Sudan, until a pipeline is completed. Russia is involved in the 300-kilometer pipeline project, and other projects related to Sudan's plans to build eight further wells, thereby covering one-third its domestic needs very soon.

British intelligence, fully aware of these developments, decided to open a new flank in its drive to destroy Sudan: to force legislation for sanctions through the U.S. Congress, which could then be used to accomplish the same at the UN. At the same time, British intelligence-backed opposition figures inside Sudan were deployed to organize demonstrations and launch calls for civil disobedience.

At the invitation of the Foreign Office

The strategy was the topic of a seminar organized on June 3, by nothing less than the British Foreign Office, which brought together the think-tanks, university professors, media outlets, human rights organizations, and government repre-

sentatives, who make up the task force commissioned to bring down the Khartoum government. The seminar, entitled "Sudan in Crisis," was conducted under the "Chatham House rule," whereby "participants are free to use information received, but neither the identity nor the affiliation of the speaker(s), nor that of any other participant, may be revealed; nor may it be mentioned that the information was received at the meeting," according to the seminar program.

The secretive meeting included four British government ministries, Defense, Trade and Industry, Overseas Development Administration (Colonial Office), and the host Foreign Office, which had its Research and Analysis Department represented, as well as a plethora of specialized offices dealing with the region. Among the think-tanks represented were the School for Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), which had people from its Department of Geography, Geopolitics, and International Boundaries Research Center (GRC); the Institute of Commonwealth Studies, University of London; the Center for Study of Islam Christian Relations, Selley Oak Colleges; the universities of Lancaster, Bergen, Reading, Birmingham, Durham, Cambridge, Oxford, and Uppsala (Sweden). Intelligence outlets in the media included Africa Confidential, Worldwide Television News, and the British Broadcasting Corp. Leading British intelligence fronts, Amnesty International, African Rights, and Africa Watch, were represented, as were the Egyptian and U.S. embassies. Sudanese came from the Sudan Federal Democratic Alliance, *Sudan Democratic Gazette*, Sudan Solidarity Committee, among others.

The seminar presented a profile of "The Turabi/Bashir Regime and Its Opponents: Strengths and Weaknesses," by Gill Lusk of Africa Confidential, who worked in Sudan for seven years under the Nimieri regime; and an analysis of "The Political Economy of Contemporary Sudan," by Alan Nichol of SOAS. Following a session on the situation in the south, the seminar focussed on regional partners in the British-led effort to overthrow the Khartoum government, with speeches on Ethiopia, Eritrea, Uganda, Kenya, Egypt, and the Arab world. It concluded with a session on "Sudan's International Isolation," during which Reading University Prof. Peter Woodward spoke.

The gist of the strategy session, was that political pressure must be increased on the Bashir government, by supporting comprador elements in the neighboring countries, as well as the remaining rebel forces, especially those controlled by communist factions. In addition, plans were discussed to unleash political disturbances inside the country, while beefing up the propaganda campaign internationally, to paint the government as a terrorist, fundamentalist, slave-trading regime.

Immediately following the Foreign Office seminar, participants were deployed to implement their marching orders. Inside Sudan itself, on June 10, a group of opposition figures issued a letter to President Bashir, demanding that he step down. This group, backed by the National Democratic Alli-

ance and Umma party, both represented at the Foreign Office event, also issued a call for Sudanese to rise up in "civil disobedience" on June 30. On June 20, a demonstration took place in front of the Sudanese Embassy in London, calling for political condemnation of the "Bashir-Turabi regime," as it had been characterized at the Foreign Office. Here, too, among the protagonists were two of the five Sudanese opposition people, of communist leanings, who had been invited to the secret seminar. They were Ahmed al Mahdi, uncle of the Umma party leader inside Sudan, and Ahmed Ibrahim Diraige, of the Sudan Federal Democratic Alliance.

Another key participant of the seminar, Bona Malwal, editor of the *Sudan Democratic Gazette*, and close associate of Baroness Cox, travelled to the United States in the second week of June, to lobby "for stronger action against the regime in Khartoum," according to the *Baltimore Sun* of June 23. Malwal, according to press accounts, "called on the U.S. and the UN to increase sanctions on Sudan, starting with an embargo against flights by Sudan's national airline."

Slavery 'motivates' action

Cox and company have been working on the U.S. Congress for years, in an effort to find congressmen—preferably from the Congressional Black Caucus—to endorse their sanctions policy. The tactic they have developed, to get African American politicians to back a policy which will eventually lead to genocidal war, against one of the most important African nations, is the "anti-slavery crusade." As Eibner told a journalist, it is not the merits of the case which count, but the fact that "slavery is an issue which motivates people." African American politicians, most of them descendants of slaves themselves, are particularly sensitive to the issue. Cox et al. have profiled these political figures, and inundated them with horror stories about "Arab militias" allegedly deployed by the "Arab Muslim fundamentalist regime in Khartoum," to conduct raids against "southern Sudanese tribes, particularly the Dinka," and take slaves. In mid-March, Cox travelled to Washington, with her usual coterie of young Sudanese men from the opposition, to present testimony on slavery to a congressional hearing. At that time, the Schiller Institute presented written testimony, exposing and discrediting CSI, Cox, and her motives. And, Minister Louis Farrakhan, of the Nation of Islam, who had visited Sudan, and been told even by rebel leaders he met, that there was no slavery there, challenged those making accusations to provide proof.

Cox decided then to deploy two journalists from the *Baltimore Sun*, Gilbert A. Lewthwaite and Gregory Kane, to do a major smear job. The two travelled to Sudan in April, entering the country illegally, and "purchased two slaves" to prove that slavery exists. The entire theatrical operation was organized by Cox's CSI. The result was a stream of articles, written on the basis of the April trip, which ran in the *Baltimore Sun* from June 16-18. The articles, which start on page one, and continue to one- or two-page spreads, recycle the same

material and photographs several times.

The gist of the account is the following: Gilbert and Gregory, eager to prove Farrakhan wrong, decide to go to Sudan and to purchase a slave. "The particular form of exposure we are contemplating," they write, "—buying a slave and telling his or her story—seems more likely to be heeded by a thus-far indifferent public than the drier, less personal reports from governments and human rights organizations. Based on this reasoning, we are inclined to proceed." Miraculously, and in a manner which is not explained in the series, Cox arrives out of nowhere to make it possible. "A call from Switzerland," they write, "suddenly moves us from the theoretical to the practical." They explain: "Christian Solidarity International, a small, Zurich-based humanitarian agency, offers to fly us into Sudan on one of its occasional, daredevil aid flights. . . . The invitation come on a Thursday. We are to leave for Africa with a CSI team from London on Monday." (As a CSI spokesman explained by telephone to a humanitarian aid worker inquiring into the matter on June 27, the CSI does indeed "offer" to help journalists go to Sudan and to purchase slaves. "The journalists cover their costs, and we provide the contacts. We have the contacts, who have the slaves.")

Lo and behold, the two intrepid truth-seekers, find that on the very same plane are Cox herself (" 'Just call me Caroline,' she says, greeting us with a warm smile and a handshake. 'Baroness sounds so stuffy.' ") and John Eibner. On the plane, Eibner gives them the line: " 'The Sudanese government has armed the militia to go on these raids but doesn't pay them,' he says. 'The government points them in the right direction, and they are paid with whatever booty they can get, property or human beings.' But, he adds, there is now a system whereby middlemen negotiate the release of Dinka slaves from their Muslim masters and sell them back to their families." Whether or not the journalists can buy a slave, will depend, says Eibner, on "whether a middleman happens to be nearby with slaves." He does not explain how the "system" came into being.

The crew land in Nairobi, then, via Lokichokio in northern Kenya, proceed to enter Sudan illegally, and arrive at a rebel-held area in Nyamlell. While waiting there for a middleman to show up, they hear the stories of slaves and slavery, all rehashed stories which Cox had listed in her congressional testimony, as well as her CSI "reports." Then, the drama starts: "As we eat by candlelight outside our tents, we get the word we have been waiting for from Baroness Caroline Cox. . . . An Arab slave trader, she tells us, has arrived in the town of Manyiel, three hours' walk away." They leave the next day, and make the transaction. For \$1,000, the middleman, who goes under the name of Adam el Haj, hands over two boys, to their father, who has conveniently also been summoned to the meeting place for the deal. Adam explains that he does this because, as a Riziegat tribesman with 200 head of cattle, he needs to have good relations with the Dinka tribesmen, who have access to water he needs for his herds.

Thus, his story is, that he and his associates, travel through the country (Sudan is 2.5 million square miles), looking for slave children, and, having found them, purchase them, bring them back to their home villages, where family members are told their children have been retrieved, and can be received for the price of five cows. (The journalists feel bad about having been able to free only two slaves, but their concerns are assuaged by the knowledge that "Christian Solidarity International, the Swiss humanitarian group that brought us here illegally, is leaving enough money with the local authorities to free 15 slaves." A curious note, considering that the CSI otherwise claims its funds go only for humanitarian aid; they don't "buy slaves into freedom.")

In a culture dominated by television and Hollywood, such adventurous tales probably appear credible. To anyone with any knowledge of the situation in Sudan—or other African countries, for that matter—it is not difficult to separate the fact from the fiction, even underneath the purple prose. As Sudan's ambassador in Washington, Mahdi Ibrahim Mohammed, explained to the same journalists, tribal strife, in Sudan and elsewhere, usually over scarce water resources, often leads to conflict, in which hostages are taken. "The traditional way of resolving it," he said, "is to contact the chieftains of the neighboring tribes and establish a mediation which will conclude in agreement to exchange the people who have been taken by each party." A similar presentation about these tribal practices was made in Washington in April, at a Schiller Institute conference on Sudan, by Angelo Beda, Sudan's minister for Public Affairs and Administration Reform. Beda, himself a Catholic from southern Sudan, stressed that the ability of the central government to intervene to encourage such resolution, is hampered in precisely those areas where the war is still being fought. He reported, that the occurrence of tribal conflict and hostage-taking went far back in time, including the period of colonial rule.

Cox's fraud on the Congress

The *Baltimore Sun* spread represents a classic case of intelligence services' use of journalism, to launch a political operation. It is no coincidence, that the same story was run, in abbreviated form, in *Time* magazine, and reported on CNN, as well as other media. Not one of the obliging media outlets has found it opportune to ask certain obvious questions regarding the curious role of Cox and the CSI in the matter. That a member of the House of Lords and long-term intelligence operative, uses a "humanitarian" organization cover, to arrange for journalists to enter a sovereign country illegally; that the same political personality maintains a network of collaborators among insurgent forces against a sovereign government; further, that the same woman stages the transfer of considerable sums of money for human beings, presenting it as "buying slaves into freedom"—should raise questions.

Instead, politicians in the United States are being manipu-

lated, to respond according to British intelligence's profile. On June 24, in a clear case of overkill, the anti-slavery crusade reached Congress again, when Maghoub el-Tigani, head of the Sudanese Human Rights Organization, briefed the bipartisan Human Rights Caucus on slavery in Sudan. El-Tigani, whose operation is part of the National Democratic Alliance run by Baroness Cox, and was present at the infamous Foreign Office seminar, claimed that 10,000 slaves were being held "under government control" in Sudan. Rep. Edward Royce, (R-Calif.), reportedly opened the hearing by pointing to the *Baltimore Sun* series as the latest "evidence" of slavery in Sudan! Royce "predicted" that legislation for sanctions would soon be passed. The head of the Congressional Black Caucus, Donald Payne, according to a *Baltimore Sun* news article following the three-day propaganda barrage, "will propose a total multinational economic embargo, except for humanitarian aid, on Sudan, 'until appropriate action is taken to eliminate chattel slavery.'" The same paper reported that a draft for Payne's legislation calls for "an international arms blockade against the government in Khartoum. . . ; the stationing of UN and U.S. human rights monitors in the region: a UN plan to 'to put an end to slavery where it exists.' To drum up support, it will be necessary for organizations of African Americans to join the crusade." According to the *Sun* on June 23, the executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), Kweisi Mfume, said, after the appearance of the *Baltimore Sun* extravaganza, that his organization would become more active in opposing slavery. (Mfume is the former head of the Congressional Black Caucus.) The NAACP is said to be preparing proposals for sanctions against Khartoum, for its annual convention next month. An NAACP board member, Joe Madison, told the *Sun*, "This is going to have to become a major, major issue in this country. It is going to take time."

If the fraud perpetrated on the Congress by Cox for British intelligence, through the pages of the *Baltimore Sun*, is successful, and the Congress does vote up sanctions against Sudan, a dynamic will be unleashed in the Horn of Africa, which will kill millions of Africans. If sanctions are imposed, and the British strategy is successful, to overthrow the current government, chop up the country into the "six micro-states" Eibner has proposed, and unleash genocidal war throughout eastern Africa, then the members of the Congress will have made themselves coresponsible.

In this light, is it too much for the American citizen to demand, that any congressman contemplating such action, of such devastating scope and consequences, have the moral fiber and honesty, to find out for himself what is fact and what is fiction? Is it too much for the American citizen to demand, that such congressmen at least visit Sudan and use their own eyes, ears, and minds to determine what is true and what is false? Or is British intelligence, with its paid pens in the *Baltimore Sun*, the bible on which our lawmakers have sworn?

Tibet: a geopolitical tool deployed against German-Chinese ties

by Mary Burdman and Rainer Apel

Readers of *EIR*'s June 14 *Feature* story, "Beijing's Grand Design for Eurasian Development," will appreciate the reasons for the wrecking operation being run against German-Chinese relations by Britain's leading submarine in the Federal Republic, Count Otto Lambsdorff, his Friedrich Naumann Foundation, and his allies, the Dalai Lama and the so-called "Tibetan government in exile." The Dalai Lama is an operation of Prince Philip's World Wide Fund for Nature, and is committed to splitting the western and northern regions off from China—the very regions China is striving to develop with the Euro-Asia Continental Bridge.

Germany is China's closest economic partner in western Europe, and close German-Chinese relations are essential, if the Euro-Asia Continental Bridge is to succeed. Germany is, still, Europe's greatest economic power, and the center of the Paris-Berlin-Vienna "Productive Triangle," which Lyndon LaRouche designated as the essential western pole for developing the Eurasian landmass.

Leaders in the two nations understand the importance of these relations. At the May 7-9 International Symposium on the Economic Development of the Regions along the New Euro-Asia Continental Bridge, in Beijing, an official of Shaanxi province stated: "This Continental Bridge of today connects in the East with the Northeastern Asian Economic Rim, which is composed of Japan, Korea, and China, passes through Middle and Western Asia . . . and joins in the west to the Central European Region which is formed by triangle of Paris, Berlin, and Vienna."

Chancellor Helmut Kohl has striven to develop Chinese-German relations; he has visited China four times since he became chancellor in 1982. Last year, trade exceeded \$17 billion, double that of five years ago. Chinese President Jiang Zemin, Prime Minister Li Peng, and Executive Vice Premier Zhu Rongji have all visited Germany since 1994.

In May 1995, when the Dalai Lama was received by German Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel in Bonn, Chancellor Kohl made clear that Germany's China policy is a "*Chefsache*," or priority item, handled directly by the chancellor's office rather than the Foreign Ministry.

It is exactly these relations which Count Lambsdorff and