

Commission of B'nai B'rith (ADC). The ADC, in turn, is a de facto arm of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth's Privy Council, sporting, as it does, three members of the Privy Council on its board."

The *EIR* spokesman continued, "Everything which has appeared in the Murdoch-circulated libels—and I mean everything—was utterly demolished in two recent writings by Mr. LaRouche: his Jan. 27, 2001 piece, 'Look At What Happened in Brazil,' which addressed the almost simultaneous attacks against him in Brazil and Australia by agencies acting on behalf of the British Crown (respectively, the World Wide Fund for Nature, founded by Prince Philip, and the ADC), and his May 1, 2001 'A New Old Libel Against Me,' in which he ripped apart an ADC-authored report of February 2001, which, he observed in passing, was composed of 'only time-wearied libels which have been exposed, repeatedly, widely, and amply as fraudulent, many years earlier.' Both of these pieces have been widely circulated in Australia, so there is no way that Murdoch would not be aware of their contents, and therefore not know that he was lying.

"In the first of these, Mr. LaRouche noted that the attacks coincided with the inauguration of the fawningly pro-royal George W. Bush, whose father Sir George Bush, had been knighted for his service to the Crown. Now, however, the international strategic environment is shifting, in large part due to LaRouche's own role in creating an increasingly effective international anti-Bush coalition, including within the U.S. Congress. LaRouche's influence is visibly growing by the day, whether in his role in derailing Bush's drive for crisis-management fascism; in the international fight to save D.C. General Hospital, the only full-service public hospital in the U.S. capital, and the one serving much of the city's African-American population; in the fight to stop such Bush-affiliated energy pirates such as Enron and Reliant from stealing the U.S. population blind; or, in the extraordinary forward progress in the Eurasian Land-Bridge bringing together Western Europe with Russia, China, and India, among others, as a potential engine of global economic recovery.

"And," continued the *EIR* spokesman, "all of this is taking place in the context of the greatest economic crash in history, in which the power of the Crown-centered financial oligarchy is shaken in a way that it has not been since at least the American Revolution, and which crash LaRouche has uniquely forecast. His credibility, therefore, is skyrocketing. So, it is no wonder that such flunkies of the Crown as the Bush-loving Commonwealth media baron Murdoch (who himself, I understand, has already lost at least a few hundred million dollars recently), would become hysterical.

"Furthermore," the spokesman concluded, "if Murdoch is so convinced that LaRouche is such a truly bad guy, then why doesn't he publish this drivel in his *New York Post*, to warn unsuspecting Americans? Because he knows, that if he dared to publish such garbage in the United States, that LaRouche is a 'racist,' or 'anti-Semitic,' he would be laughed all the way back to Australia."

---

## Africa

---

# Powell Talks Peace, Bush Foments War

by Uwe Friesicke

The new offensive of the Sudanese People's Liberation Army (SPLA) in the southwest of Sudan against government-held towns proves quite clearly how fraudulent the U.S. Secretary of State's peace declarations were, when he visited four countries in Africa—Mali, South Africa, Kenya and Uganda—over May 23-28. On May 26, Colin Powell declared at a press conference in Nairobi: "We are anxious to see reconciliation in Sudan. We are not against any side. We want to see reconciliation. I hope that as we move forward we can find a way to bring a cease-fire into effect, and then move towards peaceful reconciliation of this long-standing conflict, which has caused so much distress in the region."

While Powell was uttering sweet words of peace and reconciliation, the leader of the SPLA, John Garang, ordered his troops to escalate their assault on government-held territory in the southwestern and to take two important towns, Raga and Deim Zubeir, close to Sudan's border with the Central African Republic. Garang, who, only two weeks earlier, on the 18th anniversary of the SPLA's founding, had reemphasized his commitment to topple the Khartoum government by all diplomatic and military means available, could not have done this, without having received the go-ahead from the U.S. and British governments. Before Powell had left for Africa, his State Department announced that it had contracted with a Reston, Virginia defense contractor, Dyn Corp., to supply \$3 million in logistical equipment and training to rebel groups fighting the Sudanese government.

But the actual support for Garang's troops is much more substantial, and probably consists of significant new deliveries of military hardware and military training from U.S., British, Israeli, and Ugandan sources, which made the recent military successes of the SPLA possible. In all likelihood, the U.S. military also supplies Garang with the necessary satellite intelligence about positions and movements of Sudanese government forces, as the U.S. military has repeatedly done for the Uganda- and Rwanda-backed rebel forces in the Congo.

## More Humanitarian Disasters

According to Sudan's Roman Catholic Information office, Garang's military offensive in the western Bahr el Ghazal province, has displaced more than 57,000 people, many of them fleeing from the fighting around Raga, northwards into desert areas, where water and food are scarce.

The situation in western Sudan is deteriorating rapidly into another major humanitarian disaster, caused by the Garang forces' U.S.- and British-backed military offensive. How serious, then, are the humanitarian concerns of Colin Powell and the anti-Sudan lobby in the U.S. Congress, which on June 13 approved legislation that authorizes the U.S. President to give another \$10 million to the rebels?

On May 27, Powell announced that the State Department Agency for International Development (USAID) would deliver 40,000 tons of food for needy Sudanese on both sides of the conflict. He even ordered his newly appointed administrator for humanitarian operations in Sudan, Andrew Natsios, to divert a ship carrying 17,000 tons of food from the Indian Ocean to Port Sudan on the Red Sea. But all the time, Powell must have known about Garang's preparations for the offensive in Bahr el Ghazal. If the Pentagon and State Department withheld that information for war preparation in Sudan from him, while he was in Nairobi and Kampala calling for reconciliation and impartiality of the U.S. government vis-à-vis the conflict, he should at least have the courage to resign in protest.

But more likely, as his utterances in Kampala in support of Uganda's dictator Yoweri Museveni indicate, Powell plays an active part in the Bush Administration's imperial policy towards Africa, which is designed to fool African leaders into believing that, under President Bush, Africa policy has changed to a more constructive approach, if only because his Secretary of State and National Security Adviser have dark skin.

There is an obvious fraud involved, when Secretary Powell or government-linked thinktanks, such as the Washington Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), talk of peace for Africa. The only new element in the Republican Bush Administration, is its special commitment to geopolitically controlling the oil-producing areas. The Anglo-American-backed military offensive of John Garang's SPLA has succeeded in positioning the rebel forces to try and encircle the oilfields near Bentiu, in the heart of Sudan's south. Therefore, the warnings from Sudan's President Gen. Omar Hassan al-Bashir, that the SPLA is seeking to seize the oilfields, drive away foreign oil companies, and replace them with U.S. oil firms, are fully justified. President al-Bashir told an interviewer with the Egyptian weekly *Al-Ahram*, that the goal of the Bush Administration would be to split Sudan into two, by supporting the SPLA with money and weapons. One must add that this American policy fits hand-in-glove with traditional British policy — divide and rule — in Sudan.

### **Effusive Praise for Museveni**

Before Powell's trip to Africa, there had been some speculation about criticisms that might be raised against the two most notorious Anglo-American puppets in East Africa, President Yoweri Museveni of Uganda and President Paul Kagame of Rwanda. A recent United Nations report had shown, how blatantly both leaders and their military were using the

occupation of eastern Congo to loot the Congo of everything in sight — gold, diamonds, and timber. Another report by the International Rescue Committee put the death toll from the war in the Congo at more than 2.5 million since 1998. This scandal had already become the subject of hearings in the U.S. Congress sponsored by Rep. Cynthia McKinney (D) of Georgia (see *EIR*, June 1, 2001).

But far from criticizing the Ugandan dictator, Powell praised him again the exemplar of a responsible African leader. And the U.S. Secretary of State made a complete fool of himself when, unprompted, he praised Museveni for the success of the recent elections in Uganda, saying, "I complimented him on his recent election and, looking forward also, I noted the parliamentary elections next month that we trust will be free and fair. I presented the compliments of President Bush on his election as well. We have good relations with Uganda." Powell was speaking at a May 27 press conference in Kampala, with Museveni at his side.

But everybody in Africa knows that Museveni rigged his last election, and that there is no political freedom in the country at all. When a reporter raised a question with Powell about the complete absence of political freedom in Museveni's Uganda, Powell almost fell over himself to praise the Ugandan dictator as a great leader for his people. He said: "I think each country has to find its right pace, and adopt democracy in accordance with its own culture. I think that Uganda is moving in the right direction, and I hope, as it moves into the future, it will find more and more opportunities to allow free and open political debate. But, I must say, I am impressed by what the President has been able to do, since he took over the leadership of this country in 1986. Great progress has been made, and when you consider where the country was in 1986, the actions he has taken have certainly benefitted the people of Uganda, and I think he has a clear idea of where he wants to take his country in the future."

Even when another reporter brought up the UN report on Uganda's looting of the Congo, Powell defended Museveni: "I am pleased the President has appointed a judiciary committee to look at those issues."

If the U.S. Secretary of State, in the name of his President — as foolish as that President may be — makes such statements, so contrary to the known facts of how the Ugandan dictator has ruined his own country and ruined the entire region of the Great Lakes, the Congo, and southern Sudan, through exporting war to all his neighbors, one must draw serious conclusions about the intentions of U.S. policy in Africa.

### **Powell: No Exception to the Team**

Secretary Powell's propaganda for democracy, free markets, and peaceful conflict resolution, which he spelled out in all his press conferences and public speeches in Bamako, Pretoria, Nairobi, and Kampala, is for the credulous, both inside and outside of Africa. Brutal geopolitical interests are the guiding goals: For this, Museveni is being used as he was



*Yoweri Museveni's Ugandan government, which has permitted electoral rights only to the governing political party since he came to power in 1986, was praised to the skies for its "democratic" progress by U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell, during his African tour.*

when George H.W. Bush was U.S. President and John Major British Prime Minister.

Even if Powell did not openly call for the overthrow of the Sudanese government while he was in Kampala, as Clinton's Secretary of State Madeleine Albright had done in 1999, John Garang's war effort in southern Sudan is heavily supported by the British and American intelligence services through Museveni. Secondly, Museveni remains part of the political and military equation for the Congo. He and the rebel Congolese Liberation Movement (MLC), which Museveni controls in the northeast, will be used to consolidate the partition and looting of that country. At the same time, moves are under way to steer the young Congolese President Joseph Kabila, into a direction to Washington and London's liking. Kabila's adoption of an economic reform program, following the International Monetary Fund (IMF) blueprint, is already an unmistakable sign of this.

Africans, who were rightly disgusted by the Africa policy of Albright and her Undersecretary for African Affairs Susan Rice, expected a change for the better, with only those fanatics being replaced. Powell was looked to as a competent pragmatist on the Bush team, who would be able to check some of the extravagances of an incompetent President, and who, as an African-American, would have special concerns for Africa. Events in Sudan, Uganda, and Congo should by now have destroyed those illusions.

But also, Powell's own policy utterances during his Africa trip, bespeak a shallowness and intellectual banality, which make him equal to other members of the Bush team. Along with the usual rhetoric about the spread of democracy and market economies around the world, he expounded a conception of economics which borders on the ridiculous. On May 25, Powell gave a lengthy policy speech at the South Africa's

University of Witwatersrand in Johannesburg, in which he said: "Free trade is the most powerful instrument of freedom. A vibrant and dynamic market is the most powerful force for economic growth and sustainable development. This is not ideology talking; the facts speak for themselves, and they tell us that free trade means bread, bread for the neediest of our people."

For Africans, who experience the devastation of free trade right in front of their doorsteps every day, this sounds like pure cynicism. But the Secretary had more arguments: "I cannot state strongly enough, however, that all over the world, experience has shown that trade and private investment have to go hand in hand with openness within a country. Money, simply stated, is a coward. Capital will run from those countries which are closed, which are corrupt, which do not have open systems. Money loves security, money loves transparency, legality, and stability. Create those conditions in any country, and money will flow in; that money will produce wealth, wealth that will benefit all the peoples."

Besides this remarkable explanation of how money works, Powell naturally recommended bridging the digital divide and creating more and more digital villages in Africa. Or, as he explained in the same speech: "I am an Internet addict. I live on the Internet. And before I left home on this trip to Africa, I was surfing around. . . ."

If there were not millions of Africans who are victims of these policies, one could laugh about the state of African affairs in Washington. But, because the policy wreaks so much damage, it has to be taken seriously. One would hope, that more African leaders, like President Bashir from Sudan, would drop diplomatic niceties, and come out openly to oppose the Bush-Powell policies. They owe it to their peoples.