

of 19 suspects to stand trial for the rampage that followed the Aug. 30, 1999 East Timor referendum. This summary execution was *expected* to provoke rage against the UN, as a symbol of the forces opposed to the pro-Indonesian sentiments of the refugees, and yet, inexplicably, several UN workers refused to vacate their offices as police requested, when the mob approached. The police managed to save seven of the ten workers when the assault began. It is also of note that the other three were not killed by military-issue weapons, but by machetes, a tool carried by nearly every peasant in every Third World rural community in the world.

There is a growing body of evidence that multiple issues are involved in the disposition of these refugees, and that body of evidence includes clear indications that senior U.S. State Department officials are fully aware of an array of problems that remain unresolved, and which are not addressed in the NGO and official diatribes demanding that the refugees be repatriated to East Timor or otherwise relocated. Included in these are the status of former civil servants who served in the Indonesian administration in pre-referendum East Timor, the status of their dependents, and the disposition of their severance pay, pensions, or re-assignment. The same issue exists for "retired" Indonesian military who served in East Timor, and their dependents, as well as displaced militia and their dependents.

Pro-Indonesian militia leader Eurico Guterres, who is also a leader of the youth movement of Vice President Megawati Sukarnoputri's PDI-P party, which holds the largest number of seats in the House of Representatives, pointed out that most of the militia's weapons at this point are home-made guns and machetes. "Go ahead and disarm us," he said, "but will that solve the problem? Unless all the stores are closed, don't lay the blame on us if home-made weapons show up." Asked if his men still had weapons, he responded: "Yes, we still have about 130,000 weapons," referring to the 130,000 refugees still stranded in West Timor. Guterres was arrested in Jakarta on Oct. 4 in connection with the April 1999 attack on the home of a leading pro-independence proponent in East Timor.

Disbanding the militia would require the resettlement of the 130,000 refugees. Although President Abdurrahman Wahid reported upon his return from the UN's Millennium Summit on Sept. 6-8 in New York that the United States had agreed to finance their relocation, few expect the aid to be forthcoming, with the demonization of Indonesia now dominating the U.S. Congress.

One of the most important contributions to this discussion is that of former Defense Minister Juwono Sudarsono, who has warned that the conflict will continue unless an approach of forgiveness is introduced. "I think they [the pro-independence victors in East Timor] will have to accept some degree of pardon to all these people [militia and military], otherwise, there will continue to be problems." Several senior leaders in the region have also urged that the "demonization" of former leaders and principal actors in Indonesia's drama must end for the country to recover, and for stability in the region.

U.S. Embarrasses Itself in Campaign vs. Sudan

by Muriel Mirak-Weissbach

The Millennium Summit of the United Nations General Assembly, on Sept. 6-8, was hailed as an historic event, gathering the largest number ever of heads of state and government for political deliberations. Among the noble aims laid out, to usher in the new millennium, was the project to fully democratize the United Nations itself, giving every member-nation truly equal rights in the body.

But no sooner had the special security arrangements been dismantled, than the U.S. Administration engaged in an operation which has made a mockery of the very idea of democracy, at the UN or anywhere else. Violating every norm of UN procedure, the United States, under the leadership of former Ambassador to the UN Madeleine Albright, and her State Department cohorts, current U.S. Ambassador to the UN Richard Holbrooke and Assistant Secretary of State Susan Rice, interfered to prevent the election of Sudan to the Security Council. To do so, they used every trick of lying, deceit, and bribery.

On Oct. 10, the tiny island nation of Mauritius was elected to the two-year rotating post, as the African candidate. Sudan lost the fight, but events will prove, that it is the United States which has suffered the greater loss: the final shreds of credibility it had in the rest of the world.

Diplomacy, Mafia-Style

The campaign to deprive Sudan of its seat on the UN Security Council was run like a mafia blackmail operation, by Albright and company. Sudan had been chosen as the candidate of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), by its 53 members, unanimously, in July 2000. Generally, it is the regional bodies which settle on a candidate. One of the many reasons why it chose Sudan, rather than Uganda (which was also named initially), or Mauritius, is that both these countries had had a seat on the Security Council more recently than Sudan, which occupied the position last in 1972. In addition to the OAU, the Arab foreign ministers all approved of Sudan.

The way the United States sabotaged Sudan's candidacy, was to mobilize the willing stooge, Uganda, to create dissension within the ranks of the Africans. On Sept. 25, Uganda's permanent representative to the UN sent a letter to the Chairman of the Candidatures Committee of the African Group, Roland Y. Kpotsra of Togo, totally distorting the facts relative to the choice of Sudan. The official letter of the Togo representative of Oct. 6, included two annexes, from Ambassador Amedou Kebe, the Permanent Observer of the OAU to the

UN. In it, he noted that, contrary to normal procedure, copies of the Ugandan letter had also been sent, apparently by Uganda, to all the UN missions, including non-African states. The intention was clearly to influence their vote. As the OAU Observer detailed in his response, the Ugandan letter, which alleged that the meeting which chose Sudan was a “rump” meeting, was, instead, fully regular. “At the end of the deliberation, the Council of Ministers adopted the recommendation of the African group in New York which, in turn, was endorsed by the OAU Ministerial Candidatures Committee, to the effect that Sudan should be the OAU’s candidate for the Security Council seat for the African region.” So read the text of the official communication, A/55/457.

The attempted sabotage did not end there, however. When, following the Millennium Summit, the Sudanese government representative addressed a group of foreign ministers from the Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC), which groups 52 countries, and explained Sudan’s candidacy, the Ugandan foreign minister rose, to say that there were two—not one—candidates for the post, Sudan and Mauritius. At that point, the foreign minister of Gambia intervened on a point of order, saying it was inappropriate for Uganda to lie.

Albright: The OAU Doesn’t Matter

Then, on another occasion prior to the vote, a Namibian diplomat asked Albright, how the United States could counter the candidacy, given that the OAU had endorsed it unanimously; her reply was that, “it does not matter what the OAU says.” A letter was then sent out to the OAU ambassadors, instructing them (from the imperial headquarters) not to vote for Sudan.

The United States also went to the Sudanese directly, as has since been made public. What was threatened has not been made public, but if one puts two and two together, one gets four. To wit, after the visits, a public relations campaign was launched, by Freedom House, and other State Department fronts, to smear Sudan’s image, with the usual allegations of slavery, terrorism, and so forth. A Freedom House conference on Sudan was hastily organized in New York on Oct. 5, targetting UN diplomats and selected press.

The conference, attended by six or seven diplomats, and journalists from the *New York Times*, Associated Press, the London *Financial Times*, and *Earth News*, featured several anti-Sudan operatives, including Roger Winter of the U.S. Committee for Refugees, and someone identified as a “former Sudanese slave,” to claim that Sudan engages in slavery. Adrian Karatnycky, the head of Freedom House, opened the meeting announcing that his organization was focussed on preventing Sudan from winning the Oct. 10 UN vote. He railed against Sudan, for alleged crimes against Christians and black Africans, for forced religious conversions, terrorism, slavery, and so forth. “Such a toll of suffering ranks with the crimes of Hitler, Stalin, and Pol Pot,” he said. “We



U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright has done it again, destroying what little credibility the United States has left around the world, by its treatment of Sudan.

hope that the vote of the General Assembly on Tuesday will take heed of this record of brutality and violence.”

Charles Jacobs, head of the American Anti-Slavery Group, said, “We should not be here discussing whether Sudan is fit for a seat at the Security Council. We should be here, explaining why Sudan is unfit for membership in the United Nations.”

Lynne Speed of *EIR* intervened in the debate, challenging Winter and the others. She asked how it were possible, during the UN Millennium Summit, which is celebrating democratization, to deny Sudan its democratic right to be a member of the UN Security Council. She asked, given the fact that the OAU had endorsed Sudan’s candidacy, if they were saying that the African governments do not have the ability to deliberate on matters of international policy. She also reminded Winter of his intervention in the “ethnic” conflict in Congo, which left 3 million dead. Nina Shea of Freedom House, answered that she had spoken to the Sudanese foreign minister weeks earlier, and claimed that he did not argue against their charges. When asked why Sudan had not been invited to this forum, she answered, “There is a time and place for dialogue,” implying that such a forum were not a place for dialogue. Winter refused to answer at all, on grounds that “*EIR* is a LaRouche political front and

they go everywhere making these wild allegations.” When *EIR* asked, if it were a “wild allegation” to say the OAU had endorsed Sudan, he replied, “As a matter of policy, we do not respond to them,” and the forum was shut down.

The *New York Times*, on Oct. 6, promptly announced that Mauritius was “Washington’s candidate.” And, as if on cue, in a press briefing the same day, U.S. State Department spokesman Richard Boucher said that the United States would escalate its “lobbying” against Sudan, and push for Mauritius as its candidate instead. “We really do believe that Sudan is unsuitable for this position and would in fact undermine and weaken Africa’s representation on the Council,” he said. He cited UN sanctions because of alleged terrorism, human rights violations, and that they have not “shown any economic or political leadership in Africa.” He praised Mauritius as a “vibrant democracy” and a “strong market economy.” Boucher claimed that 15 African nations would vote for Mauritius.

Breaking the Rules

Sudan was ordered repeatedly to withdraw its candidacy, but it refused. This, in itself, was breaking the rules. Furthermore, Sudan exposed the operation, in a series of press releases and statements by government officials, denouncing the fraud of “democracy” as practiced by the United States.

For example, a press release issued on Oct. 8, entitled “The ‘Undemocratic’ Vicious United States Bid to Block Africa’s ‘Democratically’ Endorsed Candidature of the Sudan to the Security Council,” read: “At a time when the entire international community has emphatically called during the Millennium Summit, for the enhancement of the democratization process in the United Nations, the United States is yet again and in the wake of the Millennium [Summit] trying to ‘undemocratically’ manipulate the principled positions of sovereign countries so as to block Africa’s endorsed candidate.” Continuing, that this is not the first time the United States has done so, the release recalls that the United States has been alone in the UN Security Council, refusing to lift the sanctions against Sudan.

Sudanese Minister of Information Ghatzi Salaheddin Atabani said in an Oct. 9 statement, that he found it “astounding” that the case against Sudan had been based on accusations from “the country which destroyed the pharmaceutical plant in Khartoum in 1998 [and] still evades investigation into the incident.” The minister said, however, that his country “is confident of its just cause and of the support by the African nations, despite pressures being exerted by America.”

The Game Is Rigged

At the vote on Oct. 10, however, Sudan was defeated, and Mauritius was elected. The UN General Assembly had to vote four times, before a two-thirds majority could be secured, which means that the arm-twisting and other meth-

ods of “persuasion” had to be applied increasingly.

Once the news was out, Holbrooke relished the fact that he, Albright, Rice, and others had succeeded in buying off enough members of the UN General Assembly, to deny Sudan a rotating seat on the Security Council. Uganda’s Ambassador to the UN, Joseph Mutaboba, also rejoiced. After the vote, Holbrooke told the press that Sudan had offered him a deal, claiming that Sudan had offered to withdraw its candidacy if the United States agreed to lift sanctions. Holbrooke said that he refused the deal, and Sudan lost. “The Sudanese gambled and lost both ways,” he beamed. “I think this is a terrific victory for reason in the United Nations and a total repudiation of Sudan.”

Sudanese Ambassador to the UN Alfatih Mohammad Erwa made clear what had happened: “The influence of the U.S. in this election was very clear. We consider that we were fighting against the United States and not Mauritius.” He added, “To go four rounds against the U.S. I think is a good number.”

Holbrooke even illustrated the United States’ thuggish operation against Sudan, saying that he and Rice had visited the Sudanese mission at the UN twice, “to say they should withdraw because they didn’t belong on the Security Council. But, they chose to fight.”

To add insult to injury, Holbrooke approached Erwa after the vote and shook his hand, saying, “I told you you should have withdrawn,” to which Erwa replied, “Congratulations.”

There is little that Holbrooke or anyone else in the Administration should be proud of. The entire affair has only demonstrated once again, that Washington believes it can play the imperial game, and get away with it. Already, however, there have been signs of backlash. The *Washington Times* reported on Oct. 9, that although some Africans, especially the Ugandans, were playing the game, “they also say that position smacks of a colonialism they cannot tolerate.” And another North African diplomat was cited who said, “Three words: Boutros Boutros-Ghali,” referring to the former UN Secretary General whose reelection had been blocked by the United States. The outright disdain shown throughout by Albright and Holbrooke, to the authority of African governments, and the OAU as an organization, smacks of racism, a fact which will not be forgotten.

Despite the extraordinary hate campaign waged against Sudan by the Anglo-Americans over years, including sanctions, the country, which is Africa’s largest, has many powerful friends in the world, including China and Malaysia. Both Asian countries have challenged American sanctions and threats, and have invested in Sudan, especially in its newly developed oil sector. In an international climate increasingly characterized by anti-Americanism, and hostility to those in Washington who believe they can preside over a unipolar world, the mafia operation against Sudan in the UN, is certain to backfire.