

Schiller Institute exposes British lies against Sudan

by Susan Welsh

“Stop Dirty British Imperialist Operations Against Sudan,” was the theme of a conference sponsored by the Schiller Institute in Washington, D.C. on April 20, which refuted the British campaign of lies against that African nation, as well as analyzing British imperial strategy worldwide. The speakers were U.S. Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche, EIR’s Africa Intelligence Director Linda de Hoyos, and two guests from Sudan: Angelo Bamgbaru Beda, a Roman Catholic from the South who is a member of the National Assembly and has just been named minister of public services in the national government; and Abdel Mahmoud Al-Koronky, press attaché in the embassy of Sudan in London.

About 130 people attended, including representatives from Burundi, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Uganda, Pakistan, the United States, and Sudan—including both supporters of the Sudanese government and members of the opposition. The presence of the opposition activists provided the occasion for a “heated exchange of views,” as the diplomats would describe it (see p. 54, “Stop Wearing the Union Jack for Underwear”).

The morning session was titled “Why the British Aim to Destroy Sudan,” and was addressed by Mr. Al-Koronky and Mrs. De Hoyos. The afternoon session, “The U.N. One-World Dictatorship vs. the Nation-State,” was addressed by Mr. LaRouche and Mr. Beda, whose speeches are printed in the following pages.

Sudan’s strategic importance

The campaign to defend Sudan has taken on great urgency in recent weeks, as British operatives are seeking to have the United Nations impose sanctions, on the pretext of Sudan’s supposed involvement in an assassination attempt on Egyptian

President Hosni Mubarak last year. In reality, as the speakers proved, Sudan’s “crime” is that it is insisting upon its national sovereignty and its right to economic development. As the largest nation in Africa, with a long history of fighting British imperialism, it has a pivotal role to play, along with Nigeria and South Africa.

The Schiller Institute has been active in supporting Sudan against the British for several years. In October 1994, Institute founder Helga Zepp LaRouche and Muriel Mirak Weissbach attended the Inter-Religious Dialogue Conference in Khartoum. In December 1994, Lyndon and Helga LaRouche visited Sudan, and met with leading political and intellectual figures, including President Lt. Gen. Omar Hassan Al-Bashir and spiritual leader Dr. Hassan al-Turabi. In the aftermath of that trip, EIR published a *Special Report*, “Republic of Sudan Resists British Genocide,” dated June 9, 1995.

Defeat the British Empire!

Lyndon LaRouche’s presentation was focused on what Empire has meant historically and the form in which it is now disguised—the British Commonwealth, with plans to include the United Nations mechanism itself. The Commonwealth controls about half of the world’s financial turnover through London; controls 65% of the world’s trade in petroleum; controls the majority of the international trade in strategic metals; and controls food supplies in a world increasingly short of food.

LaRouche said that the “crimes” of Sudan were its determination to provide food supplies adequate for its own people, not to be in the position of Egypt, which, by International Monetary Fund, London, and U.S. diktat, is not allowed to develop its own food supply, because that would free Egypt

from London's control. LaRouche added that Sudan, and also Nigeria, are nations which have been part of the British Commonwealth, and that "any nation which is part of the British Empire, cannot escape without British permission," especially if that nation has the potential and will to become successful.

In his presentation on "Fact and Fiction About Slavery in Sudan," Angelo Beda spoke about the progress that is being made in ending the North-South war, which has been raging since before Sudan's independence. He exploded what Britain's Baroness Caroline Cox and her Christian Solidarity International call government-sponsored "slavery" in the South. He spoke of numerous delegations—international and Sudanese—that went into the Nuba Mountains and other areas where Cox claims slavery is practiced. Her charges were found to be without foundation, including by a delegation headed by a member of the British House of Lords, Lord Plum. But Cox ignored that report.

Speaking on "The Sudanese Experiment: General Elections and the New Government," Abdel Mahmoud Al-Koronky emphasized the historical continuity of the British policy of crushing Sudan. Sudan was an independent state under a mahdi from about 1882 until its conquest by Lord Kitchener in 1898. Sir Henry Rollinson said, after planting the British flag on the palace, "We pledged ourselves to complete Lord Kitchener's work, to free this land from tyranny and brutality." This, he said at the point the British had defeated a sovereign government by means of massacres.

Today, Al-Koronky continued, the British Foreign Office and the U.S. State Department are attempting to repeat this conquest through their control of the human rights mafia—such as Christian Solidarity International and Amnesty International. Baroness Cox told the House of Lords on Nov. 7, 1995, that "there are increasing reports of widespread slavery in Sudan . . . and the government of Sudan is encouraging slavery in Africa." This is an outrageous lie.

The concrete objective of the British is to divide this Islamic state into microstates, Al-Koronky said. That is the reason for Anglo-American support of the separatist war in the South, and while we have been busy with that war, Egypt, with British support, occupied a strip 200 miles wide in the North.

The charges brought against Sudan of slavery, brutality, dictatorship, and so forth, are actually descriptive of the accusers, Al-Koronky charged. Slavery is their problem, not ours. Lord Anthony Gifford, in a report called "The Legal Basis for Reparations," says that the British were slavers and murdered millions of Africans. But the official line, still today, is that the British "did us a favor."

So we have a case of "tabloid tactics," he said. Everything that is rightly charged against the Serbian leadership in the Balkan war, is falsely charged against Sudan, yet the BBC instructs its reporters *not* to use the word "genocide" against Serbs, but to use it against the government of Sudan.

The current attempt to frame up Sudan on charges of harboring the alleged would-be assassins of Egyptian President Mubarak, is Phase II of an operation that began when the government came to power in 1989, the Sudanese official said. Phase I ended in 1992, when Egyptian officials announced that allegations of Sudan harboring terrorists were baseless. Then, an FBI team visited Adis Abeba, Ethiopia, and the report issued from there said that Sudan *was* responsible. The story grew from there. When U.S. National Security Adviser Anthony Lake visited the region, he stated that U.S. policy is to contain Sudan's Islamic policy. The British are poisoning relations between the United States and Sudan.

British control of terrorism

Linda de Hoyos, in her speech on "Who Really Runs International Terrorism," presented a devastating documentary of the British oligarchy's role. The record shows, she said:

1. There is no such thing as Islamic terrorism. There is no such thing as a "clash of civilizations."

2. There *is* such a thing as afghansi terrorism, created out of the pools of desperate and unemployed youth from developing countries, sent off to fight the war against the Soviet Union in Afghanistan, with nowhere else to go now. This force now functions as mercenaries for hire.

3. This afghansi force is not uncontrolled, but very definitely controlled. *EIR* has documented how Lord Nicholas Bethell (now deceased) and Viscount Cranborne launched the afghansi the second that the Soviet tanks rolled into Afghanistan. We have documented how Lord Nicholas Bethell and Baroness Margaret Thatcher came to the United States in 1981 to raise the money and win the political commitment of the Reagan-Bush administration to pour millions of dollars into the Afghan war. We have documented that the afghansi are the offspring of the Anglo-American trust imposed on the United States by George Bush.

In conclusion, she referenced the statement by U.S. State Department spokesman Nicholas Burns, that the United Kingdom must *not* be singled out for its role in harboring terrorism. To do so, he said, "would be most curious now." Then, on April 2, a debate occurred in the British House of Lords, which exposed the British position. Assorted lords and ladies came out openly defending the narco-dictatorship in Colombia, denouncing President Clinton's decertification of the Colombian government from U.S. anti-drug assistance (see the text of the debate in last week's *EIR*, p. 47).

"In the coming months," De Hoyos said, "it is urgent, that the spotlight be placed more and more on British sponsorship of drugs and terrorism. It is urgent that those who have information in this regard, no matter what the apparent cost, come forward and state the truth. In this way, hopefully, we can force the United States to do what Burns called 'that most curious thing,' and confront London's lords and ladies directly."