

lated, to respond according to British intelligence's profile. On June 24, in a clear case of overkill, the anti-slavery crusade reached Congress again, when Maghoub el-Tigani, head of the Sudanese Human Rights Organization, briefed the bipartisan Human Rights Caucus on slavery in Sudan. El-Tigani, whose operation is part of the National Democratic Alliance run by Baroness Cox, and was present at the infamous Foreign Office seminar, claimed that 10,000 slaves were being held "under government control" in Sudan. Rep. Edward Royce, (R-Calif.), reportedly opened the hearing by pointing to the *Baltimore Sun* series as the latest "evidence" of slavery in Sudan! Royce "predicted" that legislation for sanctions would soon be passed. The head of the Congressional Black Caucus, Donald Payne, according to a *Baltimore Sun* news article following the three-day propaganda barrage, "will propose a total multinational economic embargo, except for humanitarian aid, on Sudan, 'until appropriate action is taken to eliminate chattel slavery.'" The same paper reported that a draft for Payne's legislation calls for "an international arms blockade against the government in Khartoum. . . ; the stationing of UN and U.S. human rights monitors in the region: a UN plan to 'to put an end to slavery where it exists.' To drum up support, it will be necessary for organizations of African Americans to join the crusade." According to the *Sun* on June 23, the executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), Kweisi Mfume, said, after the appearance of the *Baltimore Sun* extravaganza, that his organization would become more active in opposing slavery. (Mfume is the former head of the Congressional Black Caucus.) The NAACP is said to be preparing proposals for sanctions against Khartoum, for its annual convention next month. An NAACP board member, Joe Madison, told the *Sun*, "This is going to have to become a major, major issue in this country. It is going to take time."

If the fraud perpetrated on the Congress by Cox for British intelligence, through the pages of the *Baltimore Sun*, is successful, and the Congress does vote up sanctions against Sudan, a dynamic will be unleashed in the Horn of Africa, which will kill millions of Africans. If sanctions are imposed, and the British strategy is successful, to overthrow the current government, chop up the country into the "six micro-states" Eibner has proposed, and unleash genocidal war throughout eastern Africa, then the members of the Congress will have made themselves coresponsible.

In this light, is it too much for the American citizen to demand, that any congressman contemplating such action, of such devastating scope and consequences, have the moral fiber and honesty, to find out for himself what is fact and what is fiction? Is it too much for the American citizen to demand, that such congressmen at least visit Sudan and use their own eyes, ears, and minds to determine what is true and what is false? Or is British intelligence, with its paid pens in the *Baltimore Sun*, the bible on which our lawmakers have sworn?

Tibet: a geopolitical tool deployed against German-Chinese ties

by Mary Burdman and Rainer Apel

Readers of *EIR*'s June 14 *Feature* story, "Beijing's Grand Design for Eurasian Development," will appreciate the reasons for the wrecking operation being run against German-Chinese relations by Britain's leading submarine in the Federal Republic, Count Otto Lambsdorff, his Friedrich Naumann Foundation, and his allies, the Dalai Lama and the so-called "Tibetan government in exile." The Dalai Lama is an operation of Prince Philip's World Wide Fund for Nature, and is committed to splitting the western and northern regions off from China—the very regions China is striving to develop with the Euro-Asia Continental Bridge.

Germany is China's closest economic partner in western Europe, and close German-Chinese relations are essential, if the Euro-Asia Continental Bridge is to succeed. Germany is, still, Europe's greatest economic power, and the center of the Paris-Berlin-Vienna "Productive Triangle," which Lyndon LaRouche designated as the essential western pole for developing the Eurasian landmass.

Leaders in the two nations understand the importance of these relations. At the May 7-9 International Symposium on the Economic Development of the Regions along the New Euro-Asia Continental Bridge, in Beijing, an official of Shaanxi province stated: "This Continental Bridge of today connects in the East with the Northeastern Asian Economic Rim, which is composed of Japan, Korea, and China, passes through Middle and Western Asia . . . and joins in the west to the Central European Region which is formed by triangle of Paris, Berlin, and Vienna."

Chancellor Helmut Kohl has striven to develop Chinese-German relations; he has visited China four times since he became chancellor in 1982. Last year, trade exceeded \$17 billion, double that of five years ago. Chinese President Jiang Zemin, Prime Minister Li Peng, and Executive Vice Premier Zhu Rongji have all visited Germany since 1994.

In May 1995, when the Dalai Lama was received by German Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel in Bonn, Chancellor Kohl made clear that Germany's China policy is a "*Chefsache*," or priority item, handled directly by the chancellor's office rather than the Foreign Ministry.

It is exactly these relations which Count Lambsdorff and



The Dalai Lama (left) with German Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel, in Bonn, July 5, 1995. British geopolitical operations around Tibet, and the proclivities of leading German political figures to tolerate them, are threatening relations between Germany and China.

the “Tibetan government in exile,” which Lambsdorff has actively supported since 1987, are out to destroy. Both Lambsdorff and Prof. S. Rinpoche, chairman of the “Assembly of Tibetan Peoples Deputies,” have proclaimed themselves dedicated followers in the footsteps of the leading British liberal philosophers, John Locke to Bertrand Russell—the great enemies of Gottfried Leibniz, who already understood China as western Europe’s counterpart in Asia in the 17th century. Leibniz’s political economy, which gave rise to the American System of economics of promoting “the general welfare,” has been the target of British liberalism for centuries.

Lambsdorff’s machinations have, so far, succeeded in getting the Chinese to call off the planned visit of Kinkel, a member of Lambsdorff’s Democratic Party (FDP), to Beijing in July. Housing Minister Klaus Töpfer and Environmental Minister Angela Merkel cancelled their planned summer visits to China, and Defense Minister Volker Rühle called off a joint military seminar in September. However, projected visits of German President Roman Herzog and Economics Minister Günter Rexrodt in the autumn remain on the agenda.

Beijing closes the foundation’s office

Both Bonn and Beijing are taking steps to contain the problems. Chancellor Kohl expressed his regrets over the situation, including the loss of Kinkel’s visit, and Kinkel himself said he did not want to be the scapegoat for others’ provocations of China. The Chinese Foreign Ministry also

expressed regret over the developments.

Most important, the Chinese government shut down the Naumann Foundation’s branch in Beijing on June 14. This office got DM 1 million (\$625,000) a year to push its agenda in China, “a sum that is a big one under Chinese conditions, and bigger than what the other German foundations spent there,” a foundation spokesman told *EIR* June 26. Foreign Ministry spokesman Shen Guofang said June 25: “I believe the majority of the German people support and ensure the development of friendship and cooperation between China and Germany. However, there have always been a few people within Germany who tend to interfere in Chinese internal affairs. . . . So long as the German government takes concrete and effective measures to prevent the recurrence of events that harm the development of bilateral relations, those relations will have a broad prospect.” He had earlier said that the “Dalai Lama functions as a puppet on the strings pulled by anti-Chinese circles in the West.”

The immediate cause of tensions between China and Germany, was the “Second International Conference of Tibet Support Groups,” sponsored in Bonn June 14-17, by the Friedrich Naumann Foundation, whose officials are all leading members of the liberal FDP. The conference featured the Dalai Lama and the “exile government.” It must be noted, that the foundation takes as its mandate promoting radical free market policies, yet demands government funding for its own operations. The conference was held at the *Wasserwerk*, a German parliamentary facility.

The German government stopped payment of a DM 290,000 grant to the Naumann Foundation on June 3, because China had objected both to the conference, and to a resolution introduced into the German Bundestag, the lower house of parliament, condemning China's governing of Tibet. Foreign Ministry spokesman Horst Freitag said that the grant was withdrawn because conference organizers had advertised some of the participants as members of a Tibetan "government in exile," while Germany officially recognizes Tibet as part of China.

But the conference, and the visit of the Dalai Lama, proceeded. Then, on June 21, the parliamentary resolution was passed. The biggest motivators of the resolution were Burkhard Hirsch, a leading left-liberal in the FDP, and the radical environmentalist Green Party faction head, Joseph Fischer. The resolution alleged that "China's repressive policies in Tibet have resulted in severe human rights violations, environmental disturbances, and kept the Tibetan population under massive economic, social, legal, and political disadvantages, and the Sinization of Tibet." Among those who signed it were Dr. Wolfgang Schäuble, head of the parliament faction of Chancellor Kohl's Christian Democratic Party, and the main opposition Social Democratic Party faction leader Rudolf Scharping, as well as the FDP and Green Party leaders.

Geopolitics, mystics, and Tibet

The real question is, do these alleged "human rights violations" (even an official speaker at the Tibet conference had to warn that their cause was being discredited by "exaggerated and inaccurate reports") have anything to do with the case? The speech of Professor Rinpoche at the "Tibet Support Groups" conference in Bonn June 14, reveals what is really at stake:

Speaking on the future of Tibet, Rinpoche said: "In today's world, interdependence has increased to such an extent that the future of any country could not be considered in an isolated manner. It is true of Tibet also. The future of Tibet is bound to affect the future of the world in general and the future of its immediate neighbors—China and India in particular. Tibet's *geopolitical* situation is such that it is inseparable from the course of history of India and China. In political analysts' view, *civilizational conflict* between these two most highly populated countries of the world *will always position them as tough competitors or worst enemies*. There is no potential of genuine friendship amongst these two neighbors. Therefore, the *status of Tibet as a buffer state between India and China will be the determining factor for establishment of peace, stability, and security in Asia*."

"Geographically, also, Tibet being the Roof of the World, from where most of the large rivers of Asia originate, will be *the decisive factor for the environmental and ecological balance of the world*. The scientists of the world are concluding that the Tibetan Plateau will always have a role in forcing

global climatic changes.

"Today, *Tibet is one of the testing grounds for the efficacy of the UN Declaration of Human Rights*. If it does not succeed in Tibet, it will not be worth the paper on which the declaration is printed. Therefore, it has to be realized that the future of Tibet is inseparably interlinked with the future of its neighboring countries and globe as a whole" (emphasis added).

The geopoliticians' cat's-paw

Those who know anything of the history of the past century, will be reminded of the role that imperial geopoliticians have consistently assigned to Tibet. Halford Mackinder of the London School of Economics, who founded British imperial "geopolitics" at the turn of this century, and his German follower, Prof. Karl Haushofer, were fixated on the geopolitical "importance" of Tibet. Haushofer even visited the Himalayas, in the company of Lord Kitchener, a viceroy of the British Raj in India. He was also profoundly influenced by the Russian geopolitical mystic Gurdjieff. Haushofer was also a mystic of the Thule Society, the cult of the "Aryan" myth and breeding ground of the Nazi Party, which propagated myths of a super-race hidden in Tibet. Another follower of the Tibet cult was Sir Francis Younghusband, the British "great gamer" who overrode Tibet in 1904, and also became a mystic there, although of a rather flakier variety (see *EIR*, April 7, 1995, p. 53).

Professor Rinpoche also follows more contemporary geopoliticians. His "civilizational conflict" comes straight out of the foaming of Harvard Prof. Samuel Huntington, latter-day heir of Arnold Toynbee and Bernard Lewis.

Rinpoche's description of "Buddhist democracy" ties him even more closely to British imperialism. "The model of Tibetan democracy is fundamentally different from the modern democratic principles. Ours is based on basic principles of equality of all sentient [i.e., having the power of sense-perception] beings on the basis of their potential of unlimited development. Such equality can be established in the day to day living only through cooperation and not through competition. . . . Truly speaking, awakening of human intelligence is the ultimate objective of the society. It creates a level of rationality which leads to unanimity—a state of choicelessness.

"Therefore, a partyless democracy is possible in which each individual has freedom to deal with every issue according to his or her wisdom without imposition of any conditions from groups or ideologies. . . . Decentralization of decision-making processes and implementation processes make each individual responsible and sovereign to act. . . . Plato spoke of the 'philosopher king' and Bertrand Russell talked about 'common will.' "

This definition of human beings according to their sense perception, comes straight from the "each against all" world of Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, and Jeremy Bentham, served with a sauce of Tibetan Buddhist mysticism. Rinpoche had

the gall to add that “China lacks legal, moral, and political legitimacy to govern Tibet.”

Lambsdorff was also clear on his allegiance to British liberalism. “Since 1991, the exile Parliament has been an important partner for the [Naumann Foundation] in South Asia. It concentrates on strengthening the democratic process,” he said in Bonn. “Liberal politics are to promote human rights, *Rechtsstaatlichkeit* [according to the code of law], and democracy, [and] seeks to focus attention to the rights of individuals, his civil and social rights, including the right to property.” This last goes directly back to Locke, whose view that the end of human society “is the preservation of their Property,” was refuted by the American Founding Fathers.

Lambsdorff claimed not to oppose China, but made his subversive policies clear: “We want to respect the Chinese government, but . . . I am sure, that there are many Chinese, who are not in agreement with their authoritarian regime and its policy in Tibet. . . . We must strengthen the participation of Chinese in our movement, so that we can build bridges to those of the Chinese who have sympathy for Tibet.”

Support for the Confederacy

Lambsdorff has been chairman of the European section of the Trilateral Commission since spring 1994. He is also a leading member of the “Eminent Persons Group,” an informal association of official has-beens promoting free trade and other liberal notions, especially around international economic summits. Lambsdorff had to leave his post as economics minister in 1984, after six years in office, after he was convicted on several counts of illegal party-funding. The case was dealt with by an all-party arrangement in Bonn, before the investigation could seriously begin looking into money-laundering operations which had begun to come to light when the party-funding scandal broke in 1980.

The count’s devotion to British geopolitics includes attacks on German-American economist Friedrich List, founder of German economic unity. Lambsdorff wrote in the Oct. 28, 1995 Swiss financial daily *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, that “the argument invented by List that the ‘young’ industries of underdeveloped countries first had to be protected, in order to then become competitive, has demonstrated devastating consequences”—the classic British line that German economic development led to World War I. He even called protectionism the “modern form of imperialism.”

A senior Naumann Foundation policymaker endorsed the U.S. Confederacy, in a discussion May 14. The problem with the world today is that there is too little “pure free trade,” he said. He expressed his admiration for a recent book by Charles Rowley, head of the Fairfax, Virginia-based John Locke Institute, in which Rowley calls for a “constitutional amendment mandating commitment to free trade by the United States.” “Ninety percent of the Constitution of the Confederate States was written to defend free trade. . . . That was one of the

conflicts between North and South, aside from the issue of slavery,” he said. “So, while slavery was certainly wrong, the South was right, in this respect. They were fighting against the discrimination of protective tariffs.” Now, he said, “the same fight is taking place in Europe, and we have to beware of protectionism being imposed in Europe.”

Northern protectionism was all the worse, the Naumann Foundation policymaker asserted, because Lincoln was heavily influenced by the “extremely harmful” policies of the German-American economist Friedrich List. “List’s doctrines led to a more centralizing process. . . . List’s theories were one of the origins of the First World War, because it brought about protectionism in Germany. . . . The policies were aimed against England, and were harmful to European peace. . . . But his influence was even more pernicious in the United States,” he claimed.

The other “legs” of the Tibet Support Group are the Unrepresented Nations and People’s Organization (UNPO), and the Transnational Radical Party, whose Italian leader, Marco Panella, openly advocates drug legalization. He was recently arrested in a Rome street, distributing illegal drugs.

The UNPO, as *EIR* documented (see April 12 issue, “British Monarchy Rapes the Transcaucasus—Again”), claims to represent all sorts of “peoples,” the vast majority of whom are all located at strategic points in or along the borders of Russia, China, India, the Balkans, and Indonesia. UNPO Secretary General Michael van Walt van Praag, who bears a resemblance to faded Hollywood star Richard Gere, another fan of the Dalai Lama, was “chief moderator” of the Bonn conference.

Moving in on India

With its Beijing operation closed down, the Naumann Foundation is now going to upgrade its operations in India, officials announced at the Bonn conference. The Dalai Lama is also running operations in Japan, Mongolia, and Xinjiang autonomous region of China, which he calls “East Turkestan,” its name under a brief, British-allied regime in the 19th century.

The Dalai Lama is most notorious for his sponsorship of Shoko Asahara, leader of the deadly Aum Shinrikyo cult of Japan. Publications issued by the cult claim that Asahara had been taught secrets of Tibetan Buddhism by the Dalai Lama in 1987. Asahara visited India several times, and encouraged his followers to spend time in India for “enlightenment.” He had also obtained the good wishes of the Dalai Lama, until his activities became controversial, the Indian daily *The Hindu* reported last spring.

Germany’s *Focus* magazine reported on their relationship last September, on the occasion of one of the Dalai Lama’s frequent junkets to Europe: “In total, Asahara and the Dalai Lama met five times, first in February 1987, in India. Following this, the Tibetan god-king wrote recommendations for

him.” The article was accompanied by a photo of the Dalai Lama and Asahara holding hands, and smiling. *Stern* magazine also revealed that the Dalai Lama had written letters and “praised the sect leader . . . as a ‘competent religious teacher.’ . . . Even weeks after the first gas attack, the Dalai Lama called the sect terrorist a ‘friend, though not necessarily a perfect one.’ ”

Now, ever more embarrassing, Asahara’s daughter has just proclaimed her youngest brother the “reincarnation” of the Panchen Lama, Tibet’s second most important lama. Last year, both the Chinese government and the Dalai Lama, had found two different boys to be the reincarnations of the 10th Panchen Lama, who died in 1989.

The Dalai Lama also visited Mongolia in August 1995, in an effort to revive Buddhist Lamaism, where Bakula Rinpoche, the Indian ambassador to Mongolia, was “a key figure in the political maneuvering to bring the Dalai Lama to Mongolia.” Located between China and Russia, Mongolians “must preserve their culture to be independent, and that culture is Buddhism,” Rinpoche said. The Dalai Lama conducted a series of public meetings, attended by up to 10,000 people, to revive lamaism. Since 1990, the London-based Tibet Foundation has been sponsoring programs sending Mongolian monks and nuns to Dharamsala, the headquarters of the Dalai Lama in India, and has brought “teachers” to Mongolia.

In India, the Friedrich Naumann Foundation advises the “Assembly of Tibetan Peoples Deputies” of the so-called Tibetan government in exile, in Dharamsala, India, to give it more “professionalism.” It also works with the Tibetan Parliamentary and Policy Research Center in New Delhi. Lambsdorff said in his speech to the Bonn conference: “Since 1991, the exile Parliament has been an important partner for the [foundation] in South Asia.”

One of the “eminent guests” at the Bonn conference was former Indian Parliament speaker Rhabi Ray, who showed himself to be a disgrace to the memory of India’s great leader Mahatma Gandhi, by putting Gandhi—who drove the British Raj out of India—a mere third in Ray’s pantheon of the Dalai Lama and Buddha. Ray raved that “the Indian freedom struggle will only be finished when Tibet is freed,” and praised the Naumann Foundation’s contribution to “liberalism” in India.

Backlash against the Naumann Foundation

But all these machinations may backfire. In Germany, not only did Count Lambsdorff have to appeal for funds to make up for the government’s cancelled funds (even reading out his foundation’s bank account number at a Bonn press conference), but German political leaders and industry are expressing discontent with his operations.

On June 25, Carl-Dieter Spranger, German cabinet minister for relations with developing countries, said in an interview with the *Leipziger Volkszeitung*, that the board of the

Naumann Foundation has done a great disservice to German long-term cooperation with China, and has done so from delusions. Not only would the kind of sanctions against China, which the foundation has called for, fail on an international level because of China’s veto at the UN Security Council, but also, no other nation would join Germany in such sanctions, so that profitable industrial deals would be lost for no political gain. Spranger’s statement is especially interesting, because he is also a senior member of the Bavarian Christian Social Union, the partner party of the CDU. CSU chairman, Edmund Stoiber, has repeatedly struck out against the liberal FDP’s role in Bonn over recent months.

Henning Voscherau, mayor of the northern German city-state of Hamburg, said that Bonn politicians had shown “gross disrespect of the Chinese mentality,” when they decided to ride high profile on the Tibetan issue, Hamburg media reported June 25. Voscherau said that it was not the first time, that Bonn has showed “a lack of respect of the tradition and different character of the great high culture of China,” and that it was a delusion, to believe one could accelerate changes in China “from abroad, by pointing at the Chinese with an admonishing finger.” Whoever pursued such a policy, could “as well cancel all relations to China right away,” he said.

Voscherau’s remarks, embarrassing to his fellow Social Democrats around Oskar Lafontaine in Bonn, were amplified in their political effect, when Michael Glos, the chairman of the Bavarian CSU group in the German parliament, quoted the Hamburg mayor in a statement criticizing the pro-Tibetan resolution, as “lacking the necessary sensibility.” Glos said this, despite having voted for that resolution the week before, indicating the change of winds in Bonn.

Kinkel, himself an old adversary of Lambsdorff, made his distance from the Count’s actions known. Kinkel declared in Bonn June 25 that, as a matter of fact, “it should be known that I even tried to prevent this resolution [on Tibet] from being passed,” but that once it was formulated, he supported it. He also said that he had cancelled government funds for the Naumann Foundation event with the Dalai Lama. He said that when Beijing disinvited him from a planned visit to China, it was not only “overreacting on this issue,” but was also lashing out at “someone who has the least to do with all of this controversy.”

German Industry Association (BDI) spokesman Dieter Rath told *EIR* on June 25 that officials at the BDI are quite upset about the foundation’s role in fomenting the phony conflict with China over Tibetan “human rights.” Rath said that the association tried to play the issue down, at least for public consumption, but said they were quite embarrassed at this diplomatic heat on the Tibetan issue: “This is what is called the primacy of politics over business. . . . We are not very happy, that you can be assured of; . . . we’re never asked about our view, on such matters, we’ve had a lot of bad experience with the politicians on many such occasions, before.”