

In short, since the UN was split on further sanctions, and the U.S. Congress was about to pass vicious sanctions, it was decided to strike a compromise: "Sanctions? Yes . . . but."

The actual effect of the sanctions announced, will be very limited. As Rubin himself acknowledged, the total volume of trade between the two, is only \$70 million, of which \$50 million is U.S. exports. The U.S. imports from Sudan are mainly gum arabic. There are 63 American companies which import over one-fourth of Sudan's gum arabic production, of which it is nearly the exclusive producer. Sudan exports up to 90% of the world's gum arabic, which is used in the production of soft drinks, candy, some inks, and pharmaceuticals products. Now, these companies, which in fact had raised loud protests against proposed Congressional action, will be forced to purchase their product through middlemen, paying, obviously, a higher price. Or, as Rubin indicated, this would be one area in which "flexibility" would be shown, and "in certain specific commodities," precisely these firms would be licensed to continue trade.

From the Sudanese side, the ban on U.S. investments will not be of consequence, particularly in the oil sector which was singled out as a target by Albright. In fact, there are Malaysian, Chinese, Russian, Canadian, and French companies which have already contracted for developing the sector, including the construction of a pipeline. As for U.S. economic assistance, that was terminated in 1983, so there will be no change. Finally, the Sudanese assets in the United States which will now be frozen, do not amount to anything near the billions of dollars in assets seized from Iran and Iraq. It has been reported that, following the issuance of the Executive Order, U.S. government authorities entered a Brooklyn travel agency and seized its account with Sudan Airways, which amounted to \$15,000.

### The British hand

So, what is really going on?

It is no secret in London elite circles, that British intelligence has been working on a very precise timetable, to bring down the current Sudanese government. Baroness Caroline Cox, the deputy speaker of the House of Lords, and key asset of British intelligence in its war against Sudan, has been overheard muttering in the corridors of power, that "the NIF [National Islamic Front] regime must be out by the end of the year."

It is for this reason that Cox accelerated her drive, begun several years ago, to set up the overthrow of the government of Gen. Omar al Bashir. Cox has spearheaded the international campaign to impose sanctions against Sudan, with her Christian Solidarity International (CSI), a branch of British intelligence. Her allegations, that the "Muslim northern government" practices slavery against the "Christian south," and of other grave human rights violations, have been propped up by fabricated reports she has issued, during trips to areas in Sudan controlled by rebel forces of the Sudanese People's Liberation Army (SPLA) group.

The rationale behind the CSI's campaign for sanctions was quite explicitly of a military-strategic nature: If Sudan

could be cut off from vital imports, and from foreign exchange revenue for exports, this would weaken the government military defense effort. If, at the same time, foreign forces, such as those of Ugandan dictator Yoweri Museveni, Rwandan strongman Paul Kagame, Congo dictator Laurent Kabila, as well as those of Eritrea and Ethiopia, could be mobilized to open new fronts against Sudan, from the south and the east, there would be more chances of military gains. "Humanitarian aid" could be shipped in to the insurgent forces, to provide a further margin of logistical and military support. If, at the same time, a political puppet force were put together, in the form of the two religious sectarian parties, the DUP of Othman al Mirghani and the Umma of Sadiq al Mahdi, it could be glued to the military forces of John Garang's SPLA, and stand poised to take power as a civilian government.

This, in short, is what British intelligence has plotted and achieved over the past two years, through the good graces of Baroness Cox (see *EIR*, Jan. 24, 1997, pp. 22-45; Jan. 31, pp. 12-41; March 14, pp. 34-45; April 18, pp. 53; June 20, pp. 40-53; Sept. 26, pp. 54-60).

A monkey wrench was thrown into the operation in April 1996, when the Sudanese government succeeded in drawing up a charter of principles, for a peace treaty with the rebel forces, which peace treaty was signed one year later in April 1997. All rebel forces *except* Garang's British-backed group, have signed on to a peace agreement with the government, which, since April, has been translated into an institutional

## U.S. shoots self in foot on Sudan

London's continuing war against its former colony, Sudan, is a crucial flank of the geopolitical war against the U.S. by President Clinton's personal enemies in Britain and Canada. If Sudan were to fall, the U.S.A. would be forced to retreat from all of Africa, its tail tucked shamefully between its legs. Thus, while Clinton reacted to heavy pressure on the Sudan issue, organized by enemy (i.e., British) agents in the U.S. Congress, his tactic was gravely mistaken. One thing which the President must soon learn, is that it is never smart politics to abandon the cause of truth and justice. The steady increase of citizens out of the ranks of voters, as we see in the recent, devastating defeat the President's party suffered in the Virginia elections, reflects the disgust an aggrieved population experiences when its government—i.e., its President—lacks the strength to stand up for the principles of truth and justice. It is very tough to win any kind of war, if your troops are not confident of your principles.—*Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.*