Click here for Full Issue of EIR Volume 25, Number 33, August 21, 1998

EIR International

Embassy bombings aimed to drive U.S. out of Africa

by Dean Andromidas and Joseph Brewda

A new page in the "strategy of tension" against the United States was written in blood on Aug. 7, with the simultaneous bombings of the U.S. embassies in Nairobi, Kenya, and Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, which claimed more than 247 lives and injured another 5,000 people, predominantly Africans. The death toll from these attacks exceeded those against the Oklahoma City Federal building, which killed 168 people, and the bombing at the U.S. military base in Dharhan, Saudi Arabia, which killed 19 Americans. The international oligarchical enemies of the United States of John Quincy Adams, Abraham Lincoln, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, John F. Kennedy, and, potentially, Bill Clinton, have declared that they do not intend to allow the United States to trample on "colonial turf"—especially African colonial turf, rich in strategic raw materials.

One of the most cogent strategic assessments of the bomb attacks, appeared in an editorial by Ibrahim Nafei, editor-in-chief of the Egyptian government daily newspaper, *Al-Ahram,* who wrote, several days after the bombings: "Only a few weeks separate Clinton's visit to Africa in April and the double explosions at the U.S. Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania on Friday, August 7. During his visit, Clinton danced to African music, walked across the continent, took pictures as he played with children and mixed with Africans. The message has been understood that the continent is out of its traditional colonialist garb and is now under U.S. domination. . . . The U.S. Administration has viewed the road to Africa as strewn with roses. It has, accordingly, and wrongly, dismissed Europe's historical links to the continent."

Nafei, who in the past has repeatedly accused Great Britain of being behind so-called "Islamic Terrorism," went on to write: "It appears that those acts of terrorism seek to arrest America's progress in Africa. A reconsideration of matters is, thus, called for to avoid a double loss, where America's gains in the continent are undermined and where Africa is turned into a battleground in the fight against terrorism."

While it is certainly an exaggeration to claim that Africa is in any way under "U.S. domination," the basic thrust of the *Al-Ahram* assessment is consistent with *EIR*'s own view, that British-led, European-centered imperial factions are hell-bent on denying the United States an opportunity to even attempt to build viable nation-states on the African continent.

A similar view was expressed by a former senior Pentagon official deeply involved in African policy, who emphasized to *EIR* on Aug. 11, that the twin bombings came at a moment when all of Africa has been thrown into chaos, "within just a few months of President Clinton's call for an African Renaissance." The South African currency, the rand, is under heavy attack; the death of Nigerian head of state Gen. Sani Abacha remains suspicious, and has added an element of political instability to the economic crisis in the largest African state; and the Great Lakes region is once again devolving into war, from Congo-Zaire to Uganda, as Ugandan President Yoweri Museveni pursues his goal of building a "Greater Tutsi Empire" on the corpses of millions of Africans.

The source emphasized that the issue behind the bombing attack is not the substance of U.S. Africa policy to date, which has been, and remains, a dismal failure, more often manipulated from London than manufactured in Washington. The mere threat of a shift in U.S. policy, back to the geometry of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's vision of a decolonized postwar world, sends the British and other European imperialists into a murderous frenzy.

A proper investigation

There are two obvious questions that must be asked, in framing any competent investigation of such a sophisticated and deadly act of irregular warfare:

© 1998 EIR News Service Inc. All Rights Reserved. Reproduction in whole or in part without permission strictly prohibited.

1. *Cui bono?* Who benefits from the assault against the American presence on the African continent?

2. Among those with motives for such an assault, who possesses the capability to plan and execute it?

While the British and Israeli press were quick to place a spotlight on such "usual suspects" as Iran, Iraq, and Sudan, the former Pentagon source was dismissive of these ploys. He noted that Sudan is in the process of pursuing improved relations with the United States, and attempting to peacefully settle the long-standing foreign-led destabilization in the south of the country. Similarly, Iran is seeking normalization with Washington.

Certain factions in Britain, on the other hand, particularly those associated with Royal Consort Prince Philip and his World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), are dead-set against the United States getting involved in African economic development or political stability. Any American involvement would be at cross purposes with their raw material grab and depopulation strategy, of sparking ethnic, tribal, and religious conflicts. As *EIR* first documented in its October 1994 *Special Report,* "The Coming Fall of the House of Windsor," the WWF has built up an extensive irregular warfare capability throughout sub-Saharan Africa, under the guise of game preserves and nature parks, often administered and staffed by WWF "wardens," drawn from the ranks of the British Special Air Services (SAS) and other special forces commands.

In recent years, these WWF-linked mercenary forces have been joined by a plethora of British private "security firms" that have emerged as primary sources of weapons trafficking and gun-for-hire operations all across the continent. Among these British firms are Sandline International and its affiliate, Executive Outcomes.

EIR is not alone in raising the issue of possible British "private" mercenary involvement in the twin bombings. On the day of the bombing, Tanzanian Prime Minister Frederick Tulway pointed in this direction, when he told the National Assembly, "We believe this is the work of foreign-hired mercenaries."

This same view was expressed by a researcher at a leading South African think-tank, who told *EIR,* "We discussed these bombings, and concluded that, once you ignore the Islamic terrorist line and ask, 'What groups in Africa could carry out these bombings?' we all came to the same conclusion: mercenary operations like Executive Outcomes."

British asset Bin Laden

As *EIR* has documented, there is no such thing as "Islamic" terrorism. Virtually every terrorist group in the world—including those falsely labeled as "Islamic"—is headquartered in London, enjoying the protection of the British Crown and British intelligence, fundraising there without restriction, and plotting terrorist acts abroad, with no fear of arrest or retaliation.

In recent years, more than a dozen governments have filed formal diplomatic protests with the British government, demanding that it end the protection racket for the new terrorist international. Among the most adamant critics of the British harboring of international terrorists have been Egypt, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, and France.

Although there are sections of the U.S. government, led by officials of the State Department, who vigorously deny that London is the center of world terrorism, earlier this year the CIA issued a public report to a U.S. Senate committee, highlighting the London connections of leading world terrorists.

The most celebrated case of such a London-tied terror boss—and one that has been raised in the context of the Africa bombings—is Osama Bin Laden, a wealthy expatriate Saudi, who has residences in London and in Afghanistan, and who has been a pivotal figure in the "Afghansi" apparatus of former Afghanistan War anti-Soviet fighters, who have emerged as the labor pool for international terrorism. While Bin Laden is currently operating out of Afghanistan, it is from London that he recently issued a series of what he falsely claimed were "*fatwas*"—Islamic religious rulings—targetting U.S. installations in the Middle East and elsewhere around the world for terrorist attack.

According to the *Washington Post* on Aug. 13, Bin Laden owns a construction company in Nairobi, which has access to explosives, and may have provided a cover for a terrorist attack. However, one U.S. intelligence source warned that Bin Laden's status as terrorist guru should not be overstated. He has been the subject of intensive U.S. tracking for the past year, and recently, U.S. and Albanian security services shut down a network of Afghansi controlled by him, in the Albanian capital city of Tirana.

The Israeli factor

In addition to British intelligence, Israeli intelligence has a massive presence throughout Africa, and has come under scrutiny from some surprising quarters, as being possibly complicit in the bombing of the two U.S. embassies. It is no secret that Israel's Netanyahu government has been in a state of something close to undeclared war with the United States for the past several years. Netanyahu-linked Mossad circles have been caught, on at least three occasions in the past 12 months, carrying out violent covert operations on ostensibly friendly foreign soil.

The Mossad has worked hand in glove with the British in the illegal gun, drug, and diamond trade. The current military adviser to President Museveni of Uganda is Israeli Maj. Gen. David Agmon, who in 1997 was the chief of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's cabinet. Agmon, through his company Russell Resources, has mining concessions in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, in the region that his new boss, Museveni, hopes to conquer and absorb into his "Greater Tutsi Empire." Nairobi has been a longtime base of operations of Israeli hawk Gen. Ariel Sharon, the Minister for Infrastructure in the current Netanyahu war cabinet.

Israel transported its 200-man military emergency rescue team to Nairobi within 12 hours of the bombing. Although the medical team engaged in a very admirable humanitarian effort, Udo Ulfkotte, a correspondent for the German daily *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung,* said in an interview with German Radio on Aug. 11, that the Israelis may have used this as a cover for not only intelligence gathering, but for the "planting of intelligence" to create an "Islamic trail," leading no doubt to Iran or Sudan. He pointed out that the bombing was "heaven sent" for Netanyahu.

Ha'aretz, the leading Israeli national daily, reported that, rather then being received with open arms by the Americans, the Israeli military medical team which showed up in Nairobi within hours of the bombing, complained that they were victims of "arrogant treatment" by the Americans on the scene. They reported that U.S. Marines forced them out of certain areas of the disaster scene at gunpoint.

Ha'aretz also reported, in its lead story on Aug. 11, that an informant linked to Israeli intelligence warned the United States that its embassy in Nairobi could be a target. But, when the United States asked the Israeli intelligence services whether the source was reliable, they were told to "take the report with a grain of salt."

Although the name of the informant has not been made public, *EIR* has been told that he is most likely a former Mossad agent by the name of Lyle Shunk. Shunk, far from being some sort of incompetent, was a leading member of the Mossad team led by super-spook Michael Harari, which operated out of Panama and played an important role in the 1980s George Bush-Oliver North "Iran-Contra" gun- and drug-running operations. After leaving Central America, Shunk moved on to Africa, where he continues to be active for Israeli security companies.

Tracking Her Majesty's intelligence service

by Hussein Al-Nadeem

The British establishment's behavior has become like that of certain insects, which develop a new immune system each time you use a new type of pesticide.

When the United States failed to respond to the calls of the Egyptian leadership and that of other Third World nations, to expose and destroy London's role as the center of international terrorism and specifically so-called "Islamist" terrorism, the British establishment's intelligence services developed a new *modus operandi*. Each time a major terrorist act is carried out against the United States or states that are friendly to it, London-based terrorist groups would routinely claim reponsibility for the attack, knowing that they are protected in London, the safest place on Earth for terrorists. This is, and will be, the case, as long as U.S. State Department officials keep protecting their ever-loving ally. London's terrorist groups have been shouting since Aug. 7, the day of the bombing of the U.S. embassies in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam, "We did it! We did it!" covering up for whoever was the actual author of the crime, most probably British intelligence itself.

Murder plot against Qaddafi

Take, for example, the recent revelations made by two former agents of Britain's internal and foreign security services, David Shayler of MI5 and Richard Tomlinson of MI6. The two are now under arrest in France and New Zealand, respectively, on orders from the British government, for revealing that the British Secret Intelligence Services (SIS) financed and supported London-based Islamic terrorists in a plot to assassinate Libyan leader Muammar Qaddafi in February 1996, with the endorsement of former British Foreign Secretary Malcolm Rifkind.

Shayler first disclosed to the British *Daily Mail,* which interviewed him in France before his arrest on Aug. 1, that he had learned that SIS had channeled funds to "a Libyan Islamist extremist group" that mounted a failed assassination attempt on Qaddafi, by planting a bomb on the road on which the Libyan leader was travelling. The attack killed several bystanders. On Aug. 5, the BBC was compelled to broadcast an interview with Shayler, after voices were raised in Britain demanding an official investigation in the case. In the interview, which was first blocked and then heavily censored by the Foreign Office, Shayler told the BBC that Britain channelled $160,000 to a Libyan Islamic group to kill Qaddafi. "We paid £100,000 to carry out the murder of a foreign head of state. That is apart from the fact that the money was used to kill innocent people, because the bomb exploded at the wrong time. In fact, this is hideous funding of international terrorism," Shayler told the BBC. The operation, according to Shayler, was planned and funded by the MI6. The money was allegedly paid to an MI6 Arab agent in Libya, to plan and carry out the operation.

Shayler said that he verified his information with his friend Tomlinson, who received a 12-month prison sentence last year for an "offense against the Official Secrets Act," after trying to publish a book in Australia. Tomlinson was arrested in New Zealand at the beginning of August, under a British injunction to prevent him from making "damaging disclosures." A British Foreign Office spokesman said that Tomlinson could "cause substantial harm to the effectiveness of the operations of the Secret Intelligence Services."

In 1996, a Libyan "Islamist" group appeared out of nowhere in London, to claim responsibility for the assassination attempt against Qaddafi. Such has been the response of the "immune system" of British intelligence.