

# Attacks on Sudan slave trade exposed as fraud

by Our Special Correspondent

A renewed intensification of warfare against the elected government of Sudan, was jointly launched by the Georgetown Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), and three members of the U.S. Congress, on July 1.

At a CSIS forum, "The Crisis in Sudan: An Assessment from Capitol Hill," in the Dirksen Senate Office Building, Rep. Donald Payne (D-N.J.), who has been the point-man in Congress advocating the "overthrow" of the Khartoum government, rejoiced over new-found Republican support for his cause. There, Rep. Tom Tancredo (R-Colo.) and Sen. Sam Brownback (R-Kan.) were speakers at the event, along with Payne. All three, who had travelled to Sudan illegally, in defiance of a sovereign government, over the Memorial Day holiday, recited the unfounded litany of charges against Sudan, which have been used to whip up support for rebel leader John Garang, of the Sudanese People's Liberation Army (SPLA), in his foreign-backed efforts to split up Sudan through a bloody civil war—a war that would lead to millions of deaths in the Horn of Africa.

Payne highlighted the fact that House Resolution 75, which passed on June 16 with only one abstention and no opposition, called for increased assistance to the SPLA, and to the "civil administration" in SPLA-controlled areas. The resolution also called for stepped-up enforcement of U.S. sanctions to isolate Sudan, to make it capitulate to Garang (see *EIR*, July 2, 1999).

Brownback bragged that the Senate passed the Foreign Appropriations bill (S. 1234) by vote of 97-2, including "humanitarian assistance to the people of Sudan [i.e., the SPLA] suffering under the rule of the National Islamic Front (NIF) government."

## U.S. missiles for Garang

Tancredo, a freshman Congressman who knew nothing about Sudan (and probably Africa) until this, his first official trip, described how he had been opposed to U.S. military intervention into Kosovo, because there was no U.S. strategic interest. But, he ranted, intervening into Sudan is different, because the United States has a strategic interest to stop so-called Islamic terrorism and fundamentalism coming out of Khartoum from spreading to the rest of the African continent. In this frenzied atmosphere, he blurted out what many anti-Sudan enthusiasts would like to say (but don't): "I am not opposed to the United States giving missiles to Garang" for

the SPLA to use against Sudan, as long the United States doesn't fire them.

Payne reported on the support and openings from the U.S. Congress to escalate their attacks against Sudan. In this mood of flight-forward eagerness, they expect to pull the Clinton administration along and trap President Clinton in a new military escapade in Sudan and the Horn of Africa. John Prendergast, now a fellow at U.S. Institute for Peace and an adviser to the U.S. State Department, who has been leading the charge against Sudan—along with Roger Winter of the U.S. Committee for Refugees, and Susan Rice, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs—was all smiles, as he reported that Congress and the administration were on the same page, with only minor differences. He said that the sanctions will be maintained, and that the policy is to isolate Sudan, while using Ambassador Thomas Pickering to maintain a minimum dialogue with Khartoum.

## 'Humanitarian' slavery

While the alleged involvement of the Sudanese government in sponsoring slavery was being furiously asserted by all three Congressmen, the July issue of the *Atlantic Monthly* exposed the real reason for the rise in slave-trading in southern Sudan: U.S. dollars from so-called humanitarian organizations. Richard Minter, who travelled to Sudan, titles his article "The False Promise of Slave Redemption," and, although he praises British colonialism in Sudan, he lets slip the truth by identifying Christian Solidarity International (CSI, Zurich) headed by John Eibner, and Christian Solidarity Worldwide (London), steered by Deputy Speaker of the House of Lords Baroness Caroline Cox, as the real culprits for the increase in slavery. Minter reports that the Khartoum government has been "retreating" in the south, and, since 1995, the SPLA rebels "have seized an increasing share of Bahr al-Ghazal, where most of the [slave-trading] raids take place. So why is slave-taking on the rise? The raiders are privateers; *if the raids did not pay for themselves, the raiders would stay at home*" (emphasis added).

Minter points out that, since the average wage in Sudan is \$500 a year, the \$50-100 that "humanitarians" pay to "redeem" a slave is a huge financial incentive. According to Minter, in January, Eibner freed 1,050 slaves at \$50 each for a total of \$52,500, and Cox freed another 325 slaves for a similar per-head amount. James Jacobson, who became CSI's Washington representative admitted that the huge amounts of money were enticing more poor people to become slave raiders, to cash in all the humanitarian dollars flooding into Garang-controlled areas in southern Sudan. One director for humanitarian assistance said, "But giving the money to the slave-traders only encourages the trade."

When will Payne and other members of the Congressional Black Caucus be forced to admit these elementary truths, which, of course, would deflate their phony "anti-slavery" crusade against Sudan?