

In Chiapas, there are approximately 500 large-scale cattlemen, those who have between 100 and 1,000 head of cattle; approximately 20 have more than 2,000 head of cattle, and a few have more than 5,000 head. The major proportion of the cattlemen, more than 6,000, have 5-25 head of cattle. The last grouping has an annual income of between \$300 and \$2,500. But according to the propaganda, this sector is an "oligarchy."

Another definite factor in Chiapas is its religious composition. In real terms, the majority of the indigenous people are evangelicals who have stopped believing in the bishop of San Cristóbal. In the case of the Tzotzils, this is significant, because the great majority belong to the Orthodox Church. The bishop and his priests have no access to most indigenous communities.

The Catholic Church has three dioceses in Chiapas; two are against the armed movement, and only in San Cristóbal has the participation of priests in clearly organizing the conflict been noted.

Without a doubt, Bishop [Samuel] Ruiz is one of the direct or indirect instigators of the war. On several occasions, nuns have been caught transporting arms. The bishop himself chastises the guerrilla sympathizers for their passivity.

In the [peace] talks of San Andrés Larrainzar, Bishop Ruiz has been the voice of intransigence. . . .

The social demands of the EZLN are legitimate. . . . What no one agrees with, save a few special interests, is with the war, which will set back any solution to the problems for half a century. . . .

Now, the demands for a solution to the problems faced by the indigenous people, were changed for a political party, the PRD. The EZLN threatened to wage war if the PRD candidates—Amado Avendano and Irma Serrano—didn't win. The latter, as she admits in her book *A Calzón Amarrado*, made her fortune in illicit activities, including drug trafficking.

There is a myth that needs to be eliminated: that of the indigenous cultures. It is said that in Chiapas, the Indians are the "good guys," and the others are the bad ones. That's a way of manipulating the truth. As anywhere else in the world, there are some very good Indians, and good Mestizos also. There are Indians who are delinquents, just as there are whites and other racial groupings. . . .

What concerns us is that Chiapas has more than 15% of the potential oil reserves of the world, 10% of the uranium, and more than one-third of Mexico's strategic raw materials and resources. . . .

The guerrillas in Chiapas have no followers. Clearly, they do have some supporters among the old Stalinist left in the country. Communism . . . is waging one of its last battles in Chiapas. What is the worst, is that the militants from the former Mexican Communist Party stay in the comfort and security of their homes, away from the battle and without running any risk.

British intelligence footprints on Mubarak assassination attempt

by Muriel Mirak-Weissbach

As soon as the news broke on June 26 that Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak had narrowly escaped an assassination attempt in Addis Abeba, Ethiopia, Lyndon LaRouche raised the question, whether the attack had been the work of an intelligence agency, intent not on killing the Egyptian President, but on throwing a monkey wrench into a series of political processes in the region, and further targeting the nation of Sudan. Followup investigations in the United States and Europe provided ample information to back up LaRouche's thesis and implicate British intelligence involvement in the affair. There are three levels on which the events should be analyzed. First, the ground level *modus operandi* of the assailants; secondly, the immediate context within which it occurred; and thirdly, the broader political-strategic context, viewed from a historical perspective.

On the ground level, several disturbing aspects of the operation raise serious questions. Given that Mubarak was traveling in a heavily armored car, why did the estimated 7-9 assailants think they could achieve their aim with Kalashnikov automatic weapons? If, as press accounts reported, the assailants had heavy weaponry, including grenade launchers and explosives, in the villa where they were housed as well as in one of the two vehicles they used in the attack, why did they not use them?

Why did Mubarak, speaking to the press in Cairo on his emergency return, give such an odd account of his security situation? Mubarak was quoted in a June 26 bulletin of the Egyptian embassy, saying the circumstances were not usual on the ride from the airport into Addis Abeba. All his "personal security officers," he said, "were put in one car, which was rather suspicious." Mubarak continued, "In a blink of an eye, they got out of the car and started firing back at the attackers, gunning down three while the rest of the attackers fled." He added the curious comment, "Naturally, the attackers never expected to be fired at from our cars, perhaps they thought they were on a picnic."

According to press accounts, the gunmen opened fire after stopping the three-car motorcade with a jeep. Men who had been inside the jeep, and others placed on rooftops, fired automatic weapons at the armored car. Two Ethiopian policemen and two assailants were killed, whereas the other seven or eight succeeded in escaping. Mubarak's car immedi-

ately returned to the nearby airport, where the President boarded a plane back to Cairo.

Target Sudan

During his Cairo press conference, Mubarak initially refused to point an accusing finger at any culprits. But, in response to insistent questions from the press regarding reports of "Sudanese terrorists and weapons" found by Egyptian authorities in southern Egypt days earlier, Mubarak then expressed his view that his assailants could have been of the same stripe. According to the official Egyptian government release of his remarks, "Asked if it were possible to conceive that the attackers and the weapons they used came from Sudan, he said yes: 'This is possible. Sudan is seeking rapprochement with us but the *Turabi front* [referring to Sudanese religious leader Dr. Hassan Turabi] is working against us. I had a head of state visiting me last week who told me that *Omar Al Bashir*, the Sudanese President, told him that he doesn't have anything to do with *Turabi*. How could this happen? The state on one hand and *Turabi* on the other? This is the first time I hear something like this. Anyway the Sudanese people are good people and the anomalous situation now is the creation of the regime and *Hassan El Turabi* is part of that regime.'" According to the version in the *International Herald Tribune* on June 28, Mubarak said, "A group of Sudanese persons rented a villa on the road and gave haven to the terrorists. Either this was under organization of the Sudanese government—and I think that it is unlikely—or by *Turabi* and his group."

From the first press reports, Sudan was identified as the prime suspect, although not a shred of evidence to support this had been offered. Sudanese Minister of State Dr. Ghazi Salahuddin Attabani told the press in Khartoum on June 27 that the accusations made by Egypt against Sudan "are understandable, taking into consideration the shock at the moment, but the continuation of the charges is unacceptable." Dr. Ghazi expressed dismay at the manner in which the Egyptian President was handling the affair, making accusations without waiting for the results of Ethiopian investigations.

Sudanese calls for prudence were met in Cairo by reckless escalation. As widely reported in the press, Mubarak appeared publicly with 300 Sudanese opposition figures, based in Cairo. The Sudanese reportedly marched through the city, demanding weapons for an insurrection against the Khartoum government. Mubarak, addressing the crowd, said that although Egypt would not interfere in the internal affairs of Sudan, "if we wanted to, we could organize a coup d'état in Khartoum in ten days," according to the Paris daily *Libération*. The gist of his televised remarks was that he supported the right of the opposition to overthrow Sudan's government. His own government had issued a threatening statement the day before, according to which it was determined to "annihilate those financed and trained by foreign forces and by countries aiming at undermining the national security of Egypt."



Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak. By going along with the British Sudan-bashing operation, he is setting himself up for a real assassination.

Finally, Mubarak dragged former Sudanese President Gaafar Nimieri out of his seclusion, to have him utter accusations against *Turabi* in connection with the assassination attempt.

While the Egyptian press fanned the flames, the Egyptian military attacked a Sudanese unit in the Egyptian-occupied Sudanese region of Halaib, killing the station head and another police officer, and wounding seven. On June 29, Mubarak was quoted saying he had ordered his military to drive out the 900 Sudanese soldiers from Halaib, a virtual declaration of war.

The OAU at Addis Abeba

The assassination attempt against Mubarak was staged in the Ethiopian capital just before the opening of the Organization of African Unity summit. At the heads of state gathering, in addition to official agenda items, several crucial issues were to be discussed in informal meetings. First and foremost, British subversion on the continent was going to be tackled. As *EIR* has documented, the British, through Overseas Development Minister Lady Lynda Chalker, have been directing Ugandan dictator Yoweri Museveni, in his activities in Rwanda and Burundi, as well as in southern Sudan. There are indications that Nigeria, Kenya, and Sudan were planning to raise the British question at the summit.

Most important, there could have been a summit meeting between Mubarak and General Bashir. High-level contacts have taken place over the last months between the two governments, including at the foreign minister level, and, as both Egyptian and Sudanese diplomatic sources have con-

firmed, an understanding had been reached. Such a rapprochement would have foiled historical British attempts to pit them against each other. Overcoming long-standing strife between the two Nile Valley nations would have opened the way to solving many of their burning economic problems and reaching an understanding within Egypt with the Islamist opposition. Instead, it has been made to appear that the one was engaged in trying to assassinate the head of state of the other.

Algeria certainly would have been a topic of discussion as well. Contacts between President Zeroual and representatives of the Islamic Salvation Front (FIS) point toward a negotiated solution to the civil war raging in that country. Zeroual had reportedly discussed the perspectives for some accommodation with the FIS, in talks he held with Mubarak in Cairo, a week before the OAU summit was to start. Although the Egyptian view has not been made known, clearly any reconciliation within Algeria would have far-reaching implications for Egypt. It is well known that Dr. Turabi, who has repeatedly offered his services to mediate in these and similar crises, enjoys enormous respect among Algerian and Egyptian Islamists.

The other immediate neighbor of Sudan affected was Ethiopia. The good relations which have existed between Addis Abeba and Khartoum have been very important in countering the destabilizing thrust emerging from Eritrea, which recently broke away from Ethiopia. Both Ethiopia and Eritrea are formally members of the IGAAD, which had assumed responsibility for mediating in the British-backed war in southern Sudan against the government. Yet, Eritrea hosted a conference just ten days prior to the assassination attempt, which gathered representatives from various Sudanese opposition groups, including John Garang's Sudanese People's Liberation Army, the leading rebel formation fighting against the central Sudanese government.

London 'Economist' shows Britain's hand

A signal piece appearing in the London *Economist* just two days prior to the attempt on Mubarak, reported extensively on the Eritrean-sponsored conference, and urged outside forces to support the opposition. "America and Europe—and anyone else who cares to join in—ought to be sending their diplomats to such meetings, to show their support for change," said the British intelligence mouthpiece. The article concluded with an explicit call to arm the insurrection: "It may be necessary to make a harsh choice, and *give the opposition whatever it needs* to help remove Mr. Turabi" (emphasis added).

It is indeed the signal piece in the *Economist* which clinches the argument that British intelligence is the agency most probably behind the assassination attempt. The article, "Islam's Dark Side: The Orwellian State of Sudan," had no ostensible occasion to be published. It is essentially a rehash of time-worn slanders against Sudan, and in particular

against Dr. Hassan Turabi. If at all, the piece could have been prompted by *EIR's* June 9, 1995 *Special Report* on Sudan, which presented a radically different picture. But the message of the *Economist* is crystal clear: Mobilize forces to overthrow the Sudanese government, target Dr. Turabi above all else.

British intelligence has a burning interest in eliminating Dr. Turabi. In order to unleash what British geopolitician Bernard Lewis coined the "clash of civilizations," it is necessary to eliminate those Muslim intellectuals seeking a dialogue with like-minded forces in the Christian West, to thereby paint all Muslims as "fundamentalist terrorists." Turabi's influence has been felt not only in Algeria, but also within the troubled Palestinian camp, where Hamas and Palestine Liberation Organization leaders were to meet under the Sudanese leader's sponsorship. In 1992, a serious assassination attempt was mounted against him in the Ottawa, Canada airport, with the complicity of Canadian security forces. Now British intelligence is calling for his overthrow in the pages of the *Economist*. What better way to destabilize Sudan, and thus to snuff out its influence in the Islamic world, than to ring the country with hostile nations, and brand its leadership "terrorist"?

Britain's war against Sudan goes back centuries, as our *Special Reports* documents. In its repeated attempts to eliminate an independent Sudan, the British oligarchy has always tried to use Egypt, alternatively as its battering ram or its Trojan Horse, as in the Anglo-Egyptian Condominium at the close of the last century. London's consistent policy has been to prevent agreement between two sovereign states, Egypt and Sudan, to squelch the enormous economic potential the two together would realize.

Britain has also always counted on the cooperation of manipulable Egyptian proxies. If the assassination attempt was indeed a British intelligence operation, the message it has sent to Mubarak is, he had better pursue confrontation, in accordance with British policy. Ironically, as LaRouche pointed out in his June 28 radio interview with "*EIR Talks*": "Mubarak, by consenting in the past hours to go along with the British on this Sudan-bashing operation, is actually setting himself up for a *real* assassination."

What will happen inside Egypt is unclear. Mubarak could use the attempt on his life as a pretext for domestic crack-downs against his opposition, as Nasser did in 1956, following a simulated attempt on his life. Prior to the attack, Mubarak had fueled massive opposition by passing a new press law which makes it a crime, punishable by years in prison, to criticize the government. Not only the Islamist opposition, but virtually all professional associations in the country, including representatives of the ruling party, took to the streets to protest, in a show of force the likes of which Egypt has not seen in years. With growing internal opposition, any gamble Mubarak may try in a military confrontation with Sudan, will backfire, and Egypt could explode.