

U.S. Needs Development Policy for Sudan

by Douglas DeGroot

Feb. 13—On the evening of Feb. 11, the *New York Times*, on behalf of the Anglo-Dutch globalized financial cartel, joined an effort to suck the Obama Administration into a campaign to destabilize Sudan, attempting to weaken this new Democratic administration by getting it to launch a disastrous foreign policy adventure in Africa. The London-based financial cartel is intent on preventing the Sudan leadership from accomplishing its goal of overcoming its inherent weaknesses, bequeathed to it by the British Empire during the colonial period, so that it can become a unified, developing nation. Sudan is, territorially, the largest country in Africa, and could become a breadbasket capable of feeding the entire continent.

The *Times* posted an article claiming that a three-judge Pre-Trial Chamber of the George Soros-backed International Criminal Court (ICC) had decided to issue an arrest warrant for Sudan President Omar Hassan al-Bashir, for crimes he allegedly ordered to be carried out against the anti-government rebellion in the western Sudan provinces of Darfur. Earlier that day, three U.S. Congressmen, and the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF) called on the Obama Administration to focus on Sudan, and put more pressure on the government, while denouncing President Bashir, who settled the nearly four-decades-long North-South Civil War which had erupted as a direct result of the British colonial legacy, by signing the January 2005 Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) between North and South.

LaRouche Policy Option for Sudan

Several hours before the *Times* initiated the operation to ensnare the Obama Administration into a Sudan destabilization campaign, Lyndon LaRouche, in his Feb. 11 webcast address, characterized the anti-Sudan policy as a British imperial Nazi-style policy. In response to a question on the threatened ICC attack on Bashir, he

stated that there is no genocide in Sudan. But some people, including members of the current U.S. administration, have been brainwashed by the chant of “genocide,” and, “They’ve become so disoriented by this propaganda that they no longer have a grasp on reality.”

If you want to fight genocide, get rid of George Soros, he said. “It would be a terrible thing, a great folly, if the Obama Administration were to be sucked into an adventure, such as the adventure against Bashir of Sudan.”

He explained: “There are problems there. There’s killing, but this is the result of *outside* operations in the area, combined with poverty, and combined with an economic problem of the government of Sudan as a whole, where it does not have the capability of maintaining adequate security in its own country, *against* these kinds of outside operations. So, it’s an orchestrated operation.” He said these operations are typical of British Intelligence, carried out through organizations such as the British-controlled Muslim Brotherhood.

Sudan Can Feed Africa

Southern Sudan is a water-rich area, and it could supply grain for all of Africa, and it could be done quite simply, LaRouche emphasized. That is why interstate cooperation to improve water management is crucial for this part of East Africa. “Now, *that should be the U.S. policy interest in Sudan!* We need positive policy interests in these countries! We have to go in with a positive policy, not with ‘who’re we gonna shoot?’ But a positive policy of development: We have to make friends with countries on the basis of positive development, the way the United States used to do it.

He added that there have been operations to destabilize Sudan, because of a British policy to reduce Africa’s population, to preserve valuable raw materials and resources for the British Empire. This was made U.S. policy under Sir Henry Kissinger’s National Security Study Memorandum 200 (NSSM 200) in 1974. That study, which called for “A U.S. Global Population Strategy,” included a section entitled: “Action to Create Conditions for Fertility Decline: Population and a Development Assistance Strategy.”

The day after the *Times* posted its story claiming that the ICC was going to call for an arrest warrant against Bashir, the Court released a statement saying that the ICC judges not only had *not* announced an agreement, but had not even come to an agreement on the Bashir warrant amongst themselves. That same day,

Feb. 12, the *Washington Post* reported that the judges had come to an agreement on issuing an arrest warrant for Bashir for war crimes and crimes against humanity, but couldn't agree on the genocide charge.

If it is true that the genocide charge will be dropped, the case against Bashir would be very weak, because Darfur is in a civil war, and conditions of war are not considered to be humanitarian issues. *EIR* sources knowledgeable in this area suspect that the warrant against Bashir, which was widely expected to be issued this month, may now be in question.

The Real Problem in Darfur

Bashir is now being held solely responsible for the violent consequences of a rebellion instigated by British-intelligence-controlled opponents of his nationalist shift toward settling the war with the South, and developing the entire nation. He is blamed for the extensive infrastructural damage, creation of refugees, dislocation and deaths of civilians caused by the rebellion, as well as for the effects of government attempts to quell the destructive rebel activity. This encourages the rebels, whose militias are in it for whatever they can get for themselves, and are unable to agree amongst themselves, for purposes of negotiating with the government.

In 2007, Bashir identified the shortage of water as the "core" of the problem in Darfur: He invited everybody "to help achieve the objective of providing water to the people who need it the most. Stabilizing this important region of our country is a noble cause."

This has been the issue in Darfur since the 1980s, and in the 25 years since then, *nothing* has been done by the very industrialized countries at the forefront of the attack on Sudan today, to help solve the water crisis; this is what makes it possible for the London financial cartel to manipulate the nomadic groups against those who base their livelihood on agriculture.

Senate Hearing on Sudan Policy

On Feb. 12, just after the ICC-related leaks, Sen. John Kerry (D-Mass.), chair of the Foreign Relations Committee, held a hearing to explore U.S. policy toward Sudan. Amb. Timothy Carney (ret.), who spent most of the 32 years of his Foreign Service career working in hot spots, and was the last U.S. Ambassador to Sudan, called for the Obama Administration to adopt a positive approach, to prioritize organizing regional and international support to save the CPA. It is a foregone conclu-

sion that Sudan will not survive without the CPA. After Hassan al-Turabi, the leader of the British-run Muslim Brotherhood, was dumped from the government in 1999, Sudan agreed to end the North-South war, via the mechanism of the CPA. Carney pointed out that the U.S. offered to normalize relations with Sudan, if Sudan would accept the CPA, but the U.S. did not keep its promise. He proposed that the U.S. take Sudan off the terrorist list, and normalize relations, and advocated a broad debate on what the U.S. interests are in Sudan.

Roger Winter, who has worked for several U.S. agencies, also participated in the hearing. He is a staunch ally of the South, and a long-time opponent of the Sudan government, who had previously been singled out by Bashir for slowing development in Darfur. Yet, even Winter told Kerry that the U.S.A. must focus on the CPA, which he praised as a major accomplishment, even if it is not perfect. He emphasized that developments over the next six-month period are critical for the CPA's survival. He said the issue is not the prosecution of Bashir, but the survival of the CPA. He said that an all-Sudan solution is needed, and emphasized that the CPA is the best mechanism to resolve the other regional conflicts in Sudan.

John Prendergast of the well-funded Enough project, a long-time activist against the Sudan government, is acting as the spearhead to push the Obama Administration into endorsing London's destabilization policy against Sudan. Before the inauguration, he sent Obama a letter in which he advocated the establishment of a no-fly zone in Darfur. He also advocated that Obama not support a one-year deferral on the issuance by the ICC of an arrest warrant against Bashir. The establishment of a no-fly zone in Darfur would amount to a death sentence for many in Darfur.

Julie Flint, an expert on Sudan and Darfur, who is not a pro-government figure on the issue of Darfur, explained in 2007, that the number of civilians killed in that year by air attacks was very small, with most deaths resulting from ground battles "between Arab militias fighting one another over land. Flint is an associate of well-known Sudan expert Alex de Waal, who is sympathetic to the plight of the Darfur population, but who opposes the ICC campaign against Bashir.

Flint reported that nine out of ten flights into Darfur are deliveries of humanitarian assistance, and some agencies are making 90% of their deliveries by air, since efforts to deliver by truck are frequently hijacked by the anti-government militias.