

## Editorial

### *Return U.S. diplomats to Sudan*

The news on Sept. 23, that the United States government had decided to send eight diplomats back to the American Embassy in Khartoum, was a small, but significant step toward reestablishing normal relations with Africa's largest and strategically most important nation. The embassy had been virtually shut down, in January 1996, after the UN Security Council had voted up a British resolution, condemning the Khartoum government for allegedly harboring terrorism. The U.S. State Department had obsequiously followed suit, sending word to its perplexed ambassador, Timothy Carney, that all personnel, save a handful of Sudanese technical assistants, should be relocated to Nairobi, since the situation in the Sudanese capital was considered dangerous. The move was interpreted as a hardening of Washington's position.

The decision to reinstate the diplomats, was therefore good news. The State Department said, they would be in a better position to monitor developments, could "increase pressure on the regime," and would "support the peace process," which the government has consolidated with formerly insurgent rebel factions.

Then, days later, just as suddenly, an official statement to the contrary was released: the United States would *not* send back its diplomats. Despite plausible explanations by State Department officials, that there had been a misunderstanding, the fact is, a fight continues to rage in Washington, over Sudan policy.

Whereas the President is known to have used channels to seek a rational dialogue with Khartoum, rabid confrontationists on British intelligence's payroll, in the Congress and elsewhere, have violently opposed any rapprochement with the Sudanese government. The U.S. stable of agents of Baroness Caroline Cox (a deputy speaker in the House of Lords and head of Christian Solidarity International) immediately struck back: Ted Dagne of the Congressional Research Service teamed up with Reps. Donald Payne (D-N.J.) and Frank Wolf (R-Va.), to denounce the reinstating of the diplomats.

This is not a question of "democratic debate," or diplomatic niceties; it is a question of life or death for Sudan, and the entire African continent.

Lyndon LaRouche, who wrote an article in *EIR* of Sept. 26, denouncing the British plan for a four-front invasion of Sudan, reiterated his warnings in an interview with "EIR Talks" on Sept. 30. LaRouche outlined the process of war, ongoing in Uganda; the genocide, continuing in Congo-Zaire and threatening Congo-Brazzaville and Kenya; and the British strategy to dismember Sudan. "If there were such an invasion," LaRouche forecast, "and if the right-wing Israelis, who are deep into Uganda, deep into most of the murder and weapons-trafficking, and diamonds-trafficking . . . if they were to be deployed and were to successfully dismember Sudan, there would be *nothing to stop all of Africa from going into the biggest holocaust the world has ever known.*"

LaRouche stressed, that if the operation were implemented, Washington would be set up to take the blame. "Now," he said, "if the United States government does not stop, does not step on that toad, that British toad, and those poisonous toads, such as Museveni and his cronies, *guess who will be blamed?* The word out in this world is, the British aren't doing it. But every leftist . . . is insisting that the . . . U.S. supranationalists . . . are the responsible parties behind this operation in Africa."

There is, therefore, no room for the hesitation and backtracking that has been displayed over the decision to not send back our diplomats to Khartoum.

"The United States must *use its power in that area!*" LaRouche insisted, and outlined two things it must do: "It must *step* on these characters, including the British characters, and *stop this nonsense or else!* It must also make sure, connected to the same area, the United States must insist that Benjamin Netanyahu be *thrown out of power*, and what he represents, thrown out of power in Israel, very quickly. Otherwise," LaRouche concluded, "we could have a war in the region, which would engulf *both* the Middle East and Africa."

The most direct signal Clinton could give, of such intentions, would be the immediate reinstatement of the embassy personnel, and their engagement in ensuring the success of the peace talks on Oct. 28, between the government and British pawn John Garang.