

# Sudan ambassador calls for Congressional probe

by Linda de Hoyos

In a letter directed to U.S. Congressmen on Sept. 8, Sudanese Ambassador to the United States Mahdi Ibrahim Mohamed formally called for an investigation by the U.S. Congress, into U.S. policy toward the nation of Sudan and into the U.S. air strike carried out Aug. 20 against the Al-Shifa pharmaceutical plant in Khartoum, Sudan. "I have been formally instructed by President Beshir [of Sudan] to request that the Congress initiate a fair and impartial inquiry into these matters and to invite a senior Congressional delegation to the Sudan for a full and open consultation and inquiry."

The ambassador had informed Washington of such a call during his press conference on Sept. 2 at the National Press Club, where he also announced that the Sudan diplomatic delegation would be leaving Washington, in protest against the unprovoked attack on the Al-Shifa plant. He called the U.S. air strike against the plant—which produces 60% of Sudan's medicines—"an aggression against the sovereignty, the sanctity, and the territorial integrity of the Sudan, a member of the United Nations."

The withdrawal of the Sudan diplomatic corps from the United States, the ambassador also made clear, is not meant to force a rupture of relations between the two countries, but is a protest to the air strike. On the contrary, the ambassador told the press on Aug. 2, "Sudan wishes open and honest relations with the United States of America. These circumstances, as unfortunate as they are, could prove to be the beginning. And in the normal and ordinary course of life, we have seen that it takes a crisis between two countries to open the real channels for dialogue and to open a new way for relationships."

That is Sudan's hope in this case.

## Evidence turns to confetti

Sudan is left with hardly any choice in the matter, given the act of war perpetrated against the country on Aug. 20. Sudan was not the only target in the air strike. Within the first week of the air strike against the Al-Shifa plant, it became apparent that the motivations for the attack, as stated by high-level U.S. officials, bore little relation to the facts of the matter on the ground, leading to speculation that President Clinton was deliberately handed false information.

The United States is now blocking implementation of the Sudan government's call for a full United Nations probe into

the Al-Shifa plant. Sudan's call for a UN investigation, however, has been supported by the Arab League, the Organization of African Unity, and the Non-Aligned Movement.

On all counts, the "compelling evidence" for the hit on the Al-Shifa plant has evaporated:

- The plant produced chemical weapons. No evidence has been forthcoming on this count. The designer of the plant, Henry Jobe, told the London *Observer*, "We didn't intend a dual use for it. We didn't design anything extra there. The design we made was for pharmaceuticals." As the *New York Times* reported on Aug. 29, the evidence used to motivate the attack has "proven to be inaccurate, misleading, or open to question." On Aug. 30, it was reported that Germany's ambassador to Sudan, Werner Daum, had cabled his Foreign Ministry that "one can't, even if one wants to, describe the Shifa firm as a chemical factory." Signifying the quality of information going into the strike decision, U.S. officials had averred that the plant produced no commercial products—an assertion now proven to be 100% false. As the *Los Angeles Times* reported the case on Sept. 1, "The [U.S.] officials did not believe that the plant actually produced such medicines, because they saw no evidence of such an output when they accessed a Web site for it. Web sites for five other pharmaceutical plants in Sudan listed the medicines produced at those plants." In fact, the United Nations had in January cleared the Al-Shifa plant for export of medicines to Iraq as part of the UN's food-for-fuel program with Iraq.

- Similarly, charges that Osama bin Laden, the alleged moneybags and mastermind behind the Aug. 7 bombings of U.S. embassies in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania and Nairobi, Kenya, is financially tied to the Al-Shifa plant, also appear to have been based on information that is not tangible.

The very gravity of the United States carrying out an act of aggression against another sovereign country unilaterally, begs the question as to how such information could have arrived unchallenged at the door of the American President: Who put forward false information on the Al-Shifa plant, and why? The answers to these questions are of more importance, to President Clinton, and to the American people, than they are to Sudan.

Three sources have been publicly identified with the story that Sudan is working, either alone or with Iraq, to produce chemical weapons:

1. "Military and diplomatic intelligence sources in Kampala," Uganda as reported in the *Times* of London on Nov. 16, 1997. The primary military adviser to Ugandan military dictator Yoweri Museveni, who has been at war with Sudan since 1986, is Israel's Gen. David Agman. Israel's interest in Uganda stems from its desire to control the headwaters of the River Nile, which then flows through Sudan to Egypt.

2. Deputy Speaker of the House of Lords Caroline Cox, the most vocal proponent of a full-scale *American* war against Sudan in the environs of Washington, declared on Feb. 17, 1998 in the House of Lords, that Saddam Hussein had trans-

ferred Scud missile delivery systems, and other weapons of mass destruction (WMD), to Sudan.

3. Yossef Bodansky, whom Cox indicated as her own source for her charge, in the form of a Feb. 10 report, entitled "The Iraqi WMD Challenge: Myths and Realities," prepared by the Task Force on Terrorism and Unconventional Warfare, an association composed of members of the U.S. House of Representatives, but which is not an official body of the U.S. Congress. The official director of the group is Bodansky, a former officer of the Israeli Air Force, who was the "spotter" for Jonathan Pollard, an Israeli agent convicted of espionage against the United States.

People knowledgeable on terrorism have pointed out that the U.S. air strikes against not only Khartoum, but also Afghanistan, are not expected to bring about a terrorist retreat. "On the contrary," one well-informed source told *EIR*, "it will backfire, as it will appear to prove in the minds of such people that the United States will act capriciously and arbitrarily against an Islamic target. This will only serve to recruit more terrorists. And the terrorist counterattacks will then come, against innocent Americans."

Such sentiments have been echoed among numbers of policymakers in Washington—but so far there has been no public admission of the fallacy that produced the U.S. air strike against Sudan.

### Offers of cooperation spurned

Ambassador Mohamed noted in his press conference that while the United States had never initiated any diplomatic protest in regards to the Al-Shifa plant, Sudan had offered full cooperation with the United States in the fight against terrorism. In May 1998, he stated, "I delivered a formal letter of invitation to a senior official of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, offering to establish a joint effort between our external security bureau to combat international terrorism. . . . We thought our offer of cooperation with U.S. law enforcement officials would be welcomed. But after conferring with the administration, the FBI politely declined our invitation."

On the other hand, Sudan had granted the United States use of Sudan air space to evacuate wounded from Nairobi, but the ambassador expressed concern that the overflights had been used for last-minute surveillance of Al-Shifa.

The Sudanese ambassador, who departed Washington on Sept. 17, registered his frustration at the difficulties he had as ambassador in meeting with Susan Rice, in her current post as Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, or in her previous position at the National Security Council. Rice had steadfastly refused to meet the ambassador until the crisis erupted over the U.S. air strikes. According to reports, Rice had promoted a U.S. air strike against Sudan. So far, while America's relations with one of the most important countries of Africa lie in tatters, Rice and those who demanded a U.S. air strike against Sudan on the basis of flimsy if not outright false evidence, remain unscathed.

## 'Third Way' fuels U.S., British 'convergence'

by Mark Burdman

Repeatedly over the past months, British Prime Minister Tony Blair has promoted himself as the leading figure in a "center-left international," a so-called "Third Way." In substance, it is nothing more than an attempt to put a pseudo-human face on the brutal policies associated with his predecessor, Margaret Thatcher. Third Way has become a euphemism for the practice, typified by activities of the "New Democrats" in the United States, of abandoning traditional constituencies among blue collar workers, minorities, and others, in favor of cultivating the high-flying elements brought to the fore by the piratical policy known as "globalization."

Perhaps heed should be paid to the recent comment in the *London Times*, that Third Way would be better thought of as a "sexual rather than philosophical position."

In last week's *EIR*, Lyndon LaRouche pronounced the Third Way as, for all intents and purposes, a dead letter, at a time when the world economy is crumbling, and nation-state-, constituency-oriented approaches, like those used by U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt in the 1930s, are the only thing that will prevent a plunge into global chaos. In milder terms, *Times* chief political correspondent Peter Riddell warned Blair, in a Sept. 14 commentary, that the impact of the global economic crisis on Britain might force Blair to move away from the Third Way, and to deal with the demands of labor unions and others being badly hit by that crisis.

At present, the reality factor of global economic collapse is not stopping Blair and other utopians from pushing on with their Third Way drive. Blair's guru, London School of Economics head Anthony Giddens, released a book over the Sept. 12-13 weekend, entitled *The Third Way*. Giddens's previous work, *Beyond Left and Right*, is a bible for Third Way ideologues. In part, the new Giddens work has been prepared, in anticipation of a Sept. 21 gathering at New York University, of a conference with the theme "Strengthening Democracy in the Context of a Globalized Economy," at which the Third Way will be highlighted. Both Blair and Giddens are scheduled to participate, as is Italian Prime Minister Romano Prodi, Swedish Prime Minister Göran Persson, Bill and Hillary Clinton, a senior representative of Brazil's President Sir Fernando Henrique Cardoso, and others.

### A case of extreme historical revisionism

Beyond the double-talk, Blair's Third Way drive is part of a broader effort to manipulate the United States into an