

original military budget proposed by the Armed Forces was approximately \$2 billion. The budget passed by the Congress was \$1.5 billion. The first budget "adjustment," owing to an agreement between the Samper government and the Central Bank, reduced the military budget to \$1.3 billion. A recent decision by the National Planning Department cut the military budget another \$500 million, with plans to make yet a further \$300 million cut. This leaves the budget of the Armed Forces, at war with a 10,000-strong narco-terrorist army, at \$500 million!

In contrast, Admiral Delgado pointed out, the narco-terrorists have not suffered from the Planning Ministry's axe. In fact, the financing of the FARC, ELN, and EPL narco-guerrillas has grown considerably in recent years, reaching the incredible annual figure of \$1.6 billion—\$700 million from drug trafficking, \$480 million from extortion and robbery, \$330 million from kidnapping, \$12 million from investment profits, \$71 million diverted from municipal and provincial treasuries through blackmail, and \$22 million from other sources.

Delgado pointed out that President Samper's strategy is to "defeat subversion by forcing it to negotiate." He said the principal difficulties of this strategy are: 1) that 40% of military troops are guarding oil installations; 2) the campaign that has been launched against obligatory military service, which would do away with the Armed Forces altogether; 3) that "the soldiers most distinguished in battle against narco-subversion are accused of crimes they have not committed. At this moment, there are 700 cases before the Prosecutor General's office and 300 before the Attorney General's office"; and 4) the low budget and lack of personnel and equipment.

Bedoya: The 1991 Constitution tied our hands

"The worst enemies of the Armed Forces," said General Bedoya, "are not declared enemies. 'Tirofijo' [head of the FARC narco-guerrillas] is not our worst enemy, because we already know he is an enemy. . . . More dangerous are the undeclared enemies, the ones with white collars and top hats, who are like the termites that one cannot see but which gnaw away at your house until it crumbles. One finds these treacherous enemies in the Attorney General's office, in the Prosecutor General's office, in the People's Defender's office. . . ."

"The main problem is that we lack the legal tools for defeating narco-subversion. We have spoken with the Peruvian military, with [Armed Forces Commander] General Hermoza for example, and presented them with our situation. They told us: 'Change the legal framework or you can do nothing.' That is the problem of the 1991 Constitution. That Constitution tied our hands. . . . In Colombia there is no war-time legislation because the Constitution prohibits it. The commander has no authority. The evidence we present is not considered evidence. We have no ability to do intelligence. The 1991 Constitution has taken all of that from us."

TransAfrica's Payne fields anti-Sudan bill

by Linda de Hoyos

The TransAfrica Institute, the Anti-Defamation League, and Baroness Caroline Cox's Christian Solidarity International (CSI) are now operating as co-conspirators for the purpose of forcing President Clinton to ram international sanctions against Sudan through the United Nations Security Council.

The barrage in this British-orchestrated assault on Sudan is a bill introduced on July 9 into the U.S. House of Representatives by Rep. Donald Payne (D-N.J.), chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus and a member of the House Africa Subcommittee. The bill puts into legislative form the precise strategy of Baroness Cox, deputy speaker of the British House of Lords and chairman of CSI.

The British 'slavery' campaign

Taking a page from a Britain's long history of waving the charge of "slavery" as a weapon for its own geopolitical ends, Cox's CSI is the source of hoked-up allegations that the Sudanese government is deliberately conducting slavery in Sudan. The CSI's literature explains that the slavery charge is to be used as "motivation" for the United States to force through the UN Security Council an international trade embargo and economic and military sanctions against Sudan.

Representative Payne has taken the bait. It is unlikely that concern for Africans is his motivation, however. In 1980, the National Democratic Policy Committee, founded by Lyndon LaRouche, was waging a campaign against the International Monetary Fund's murder of African countries, and calling up African-American leaders to stand up for a U.S. policy of economic development for Africa. Hulan Jack, a leader of the NDPC and the first African-American to be elected to high office in New York City, approached Payne at the 1980 Democratic Convention, to seek his support—to which Payne replied: "Why should I give a sh—t about Africa?"

This attitude may be the reason Payne is on the executive board of Randall Robinson's TransAfrica Institute. Another sponsor of the bill, Rep. Ron Dellums (D-Calif.), also has close associations with TransAfrica's Robinson, as Robinson's wife worked in Dellums's office. As *EIR* has documented in detail, TransAfrica is a funded outlet of the Ford

Foundation, which, in turn, coordinates its work on Africa with the Royal Institute of International Affairs and specifically Baroness Lynda Chalker, British Minister of Overseas Development (formerly the Colonial Office).

To justify its funding, evidently, TransAfrica has led the charge against African countries under the British gun—Nigeria and Sudan. The TransAfrica Institute has been one of the key conduits of British policy into the Congressional Black Caucus.

Two sponsors of the bill are known for their strong ties to the Anti-Defamation League, an insidious subsidiary of British intelligence services operating in the United States: Reps. Tom Lantos (D-Calif.) and Barney Frank (D-Mass).

Other sponsoring members of the bill show the input of Christian Solidarity International, which gained entry into the U.S. Congress on the basis of its Cold War campaigning on behalf of the “captive nations.” Among this group of sponsors is found Rep. Edward Royce (R-Calif.), who is also a vocal supporter of the Contract with America; Rep. John Edward Porter (R-Ill.); and Rep. Steve Chabot (R-Ohio), a member of the Africa Subcommittee and booster of Newt Gingrich’s Contract with America.

A hoax

Since the United States has already cut off all military and economic aid to Sudan, Payne’s bill is in reality part of the pressure campaign against President Clinton, to force the administration to do the bidding of British intelligence at the United Nations. British efforts heretofore to force full-scale sanctions against Sudan are all but a lost cause otherwise.

The first bid for such sanctions, fielded in January, centered on London’s demand that unless Sudan coughed up three alleged would-be assassins of Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak in 60 days, then the UN Security Council would impose full-scale sanctions against Sudan. After 60 days, minor sanctions were imposed, but the wind went of out London’s sails, when Egypt publicly indicated its lack of interest in destroying Sudan, and when the hit team sent out against Mubarak turned up in Afghanistan, telling journalists that they had never worked with the Sudanese government at all!

Now, “slavery” has become the issue of choice for the British. Precisely timed with Payne’s ballyhoo in Congress, the *Baltimore Sun* sent two of its employees, Gilbert A. Lewthwaite and Gregory Kane, to Sudan to “explore” the slavery charges. Strangely, they wound up in the same plane with Baroness Cox, who squired them around in sections of Sudan controlled by John Garang, the British-backed insurgent in southern Sudan. According to the reporters, they “bought” a slave!

Although the results of their escapade were smeared all over the front pages of the *Baltimore Sun* June 23-25, the

two reporters *declined* an invitation of the Sudanese government to travel legally to Sudan with visas, to go wherever they wanted in Sudan, and to be introduced to government and other leaders who could show them the realities of this country.

The Somalia model

The British oligarchy is determined to destroy Sudan, as it stands today as an example of self-sufficiency and independence that cannot be tolerated in the fascist nightmare of globalization and world dictatorship envisioned at the Lyons summit of the Group of Seven major industrialized nations.

The Payne bill, if it is passed, is to function as a death sentence for Sudan, from the United States. It demands that the U.S. organize:

- A total multinational economic embargo against Sudan. The blockade that will cause untold suffering in the Sudanese population.
- An international arms blockade against the Sudanese government, along with a continuation of the arming of the insurgency in the south.
- The stationing of United Nations monitors throughout the country to report alleged “human rights violations.”

Payne is demanding that the United States carry out the annihilation of this African nation, a policy that will not only destroy Sudan, but will bring chaos and war to the entire northeast quadrant of Africa—spreading the “Somalia model” throughout East Africa.

Ted Dagne, the behind-the-scenes coordinator for Baroness Cox et al. against Sudan, has admitted that “another Somalia” will definitely be the result of full sanctions against Sudan. Predicting that the government would fall if full sanctions were imposed, Dagne, currently at the Congressional Research Service and formerly an aide to the Africa Subcommittee, admitted that there was no national institutionalized force to replace that government—just as occurred in Somalia when the United States and Europe forced the ouster of President Siad Barre. Dagne claimed that there are “factions in the military,” factions in the opposition, the southern opposition is completely fragmented. “All these factions will simply start killing each other,” he said.

Dagne has denied any British involvement in the campaign against Sudan, boasting that the “action” against Sudan was coming strongly from the United States Congress. Britain, he told this reporter, has “no financial interests in Africa”!

In the second week of July, while Payne’s sanctions legislation was being introduced, Dagne was squiring Sudanese People’s Liberation Army warlord John Garang around town. In a seminar at the U.S. Committee on Refugees, Dagne stated his conviction that foreign policy should be made in Congress, not in the Executive branch.