

marily of the Kikuyu tribe, and those of opposition leader Odinga, from the Luo tribe. This is classic British colonial *modus operandi*, and a dark reminder of how the British crushed the insurgent Mau Mau movement in the 1950s. Under Col. Frank Kitson, the British were able to manipulate tribal tensions so that by 1956, the movement was crushed, with a loss of 11,000 Mau Maus and 2,000 other Africans, while only 32 Britons were killed.

It is not certain that Kenya's population will gratify the new British gamemasters by slaughtering each other. One voice of reason was heard from the leading Kenya daily, *The Standard*, which on Jan. 3, published an editorial, entitled, "Save our Beloved Country," calling on all sides to "put the General Election behind it and return to normalcy." They propose that, "President Kibaki and Mr Raila Odinga talk to each other; that they agree to take an active part in stopping the violence gripping the country; and that they find a way to share power."

The editorial stated, "The nation has argued at length since last week about who won and who did not win; who stole and who did not steal the vote and whether or not the presidential poll should be repeated or not. We are nowhere near an answer. What appears certain is death and destruction will continue. That is why we need to move ahead with a solution that brings the chaos to an end..."

The *Standard* calls on Kibaki to make a strong public call for "reconciliation and patriotism" in an effort to stop the "death and destruction," and for Raila and the ODM to drop preconditions including "that the President resigns and declares that he did not win the presidential poll." The editors call for an international mediator, "not to determine who won the election, but to work out a road map that will bring Kenya back from the brink and a mutually acceptable proposition of sharing power. Then through the parliament the details of power sharing should be worked out."

The editorial notes that the voting, which experienced fraud by both Kibaki's PNU party and Odinga's OMD, nonetheless demonstrated that the country is "split right down the middle." The editorial adds that, "The position of President is not vacant. Kibaki was declared President whether or not the presidential ballot was flawed." After outlining the disasters the country is facing, it calls on both leaders "to demonstrate humility, care for the citizenry, selflessness and an ability and judgment to place the interest of the country above that of respective ambitions or actualisation... Therefore, in order to ensure this demonstrated leadership, the two must show courage to free themselves from any vested interests and handlers acting as political advisers or strategists and appeal to their inner conscience to save this country from plunging further into anarchy... But over and above all this, we believe the President and Raila must act first and fast to save this our beloved country."

## Mbeki Defeat Threatens All African Nations

by Douglas DeGroot

The ouster of South African President Thabo Mbeki as president of the ruling African National Congress Party (ANC) in an ANC leadership election on Dec. 20, by his former Vice President, Jacob Zuma, and the subsequent indictment of Zuma on racketeering charges stemming from illegal payoffs connected to South African arms purchases, are setting up South Africa for ungovernability.

As long as South Africa is paralyzed by this crisis, it will be unable to continue its activist policy of intervening throughout the African continent, to fight orchestrated destabilizations. Thus, the Anglo-Dutch Liberal financier oligarchy which considers itself the real emperor of not only the British Empire, but the whole world, will be able to launch campaigns, at will, to destroy nations and spread genocide throughout Africa by maximizing available options for spreading the internal conflicts within nations.

This financier oligarchy, operating primarily through London via British Empire and British Commonwealth networks, orchestrated Mbeki's ouster to ensure—just as the collapse of the monetary system is becoming obvious—that Africa's wealth of raw materials will be available to them, while other trading partners, not hostile to national development, such as China, will be locked out under conditions of chaos.

Why was Mbeki and his slate at the ANC leadership election subjected to the raucous treatment they got, instead of having the expected political debate? Because of the strategic role that the Mbeki-led government has been playing in Africa. Mbeki and his allies, despite being unable to foster the rapid infrastructural development of the South African economy as they desired—which would have required them to challenge the globalization constraints and other issues that ANC negotiators agreed to during the negotiations that led to the formal end of the apartheid regime—nonetheless have acted throughout Africa to settle local conflicts.

The interventionist approach has included: using negotiations to settle conflicts, aid in organizing elections, sending peacekeeping forces, and publicly urging countries not to use British colonial methods in conducting their internal affairs.

The latest example of this role was at the European Union-African summit held in Lisbon, Portugal Dec. 8-9, where President Mbeki was widely recognized for playing a critical role in preventing the EU from getting African nations to agree to a continent-wide free-trade agreement that would

have opened them up to more looting. Peter Mandelson, the EU Trade Chief who was trying to force through the free-trade agreement, singled out Mbeki for influencing other African nations to oppose the EU plan.

## Globalization Is the Problem

While the ANC under Nelson Mandela and Mbeki has made mistakes, and not been able to overcome limitations, what will ultimately replace these two administrations will be far worse. In addition, Mandela and Mbeki were from the Xhosa ethnic grouping which was predominant in the ANC leadership. Zuma has a Zulu ethnic background. The financier oligarchy can be expected to play classic colonialist dirty tricks to foster ethnic conflict, to create conditions of instability.

The London-vectored financier cartel was able to engineer Mbeki's defeat, because he has been unable to engender confidence among the South African population that his policies of going along with globalization, and appeasing the financial markets, could rapidly lift them out of poverty and improve their lives. The agreements the ANC negotiated with the former apartheid government in 1993-94, before Mandela was elected the first President of an apartheid-free South Africa, put South Africa under the thumb of International Monetary Fund and World Bank policies, the conditionalities of the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade which led to the World Trade Organization, in addition to taking on substantial debt from the apartheid government. These institutions enforced the rules of globalization, which strictly limit the role a government can play in national development. They call instead for privatization—selling off state-owned industry and infrastructure for the benefit of mainly foreign financial “locusts.”

Mandela later admitted that fear of a market collapse played a big role in the ANC's acceptance of this deal: “The very mobility of capital and the globalisation of the capital and other markets,” he told the ANC national conference in 1997, “make it impossible for countries, for instance, to decide national economic policy without regard to the likely response of these markets.”

At the time Mandela said this, Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir bin Mohamad did successfully defy the IMF and the markets, by imposing capital controls and exchange controls.

Mbeki also accepted the globalization framework: While Mandela was still President, Mbeki in 1996 revealed a new economic plan which called for more privatization, cutbacks to government spending, labor “flexibility,” freer trade, and even looser controls on money flows, as a signal to potential investors. During these negotiations, a strong nationalist ANC leader Chris Hani, who some wanted to follow Mandela as President, was assassinated, an obvious move to intimidate those who wanted to follow a more in-

dependent economic policy framework for post-apartheid South Africa.

As a result, although South Africa has the most advanced industrial sector in Africa, by accepting the globalization framework, Mbeki was not able to use this capability to develop the country. The industrial capacity remains primarily oriented to the huge mining sector, which dominates the economy. Four megaconglomerates account for 80% of the Johannesburg Stock Exchange. For example, three of the world's largest mining companies, Rio Tinto PLC, Anglo American PLC, and DeBeers operate extensively in southern Africa.

## London Calls the Shots

The ouster of Mbeki and his allies from the leadership of the ANC has nothing to do with local South African political rivalries. They were targeted by the predominantly London-centered financier cartel which controls the mining conglomerates, and hence much of the economy of South Africa. Continuing poverty was the lever used by the Congress of South African Trade Unions and the South African Communist Party, which supported the Zuma slate, to manipulate the ANC rank and file against Mbeki's slate. “We've got political freedom. Where is the development to get us out of this poverty?” is a common sentiment in South Africa.

The rank and file didn't know that shortly before the ANC election, Zuma went to India, Britain, and the United States to assure the financier cartel that there would be no change in South African economic policy if he ousted Mbeki, and ultimately became head of the ANC, and President of South Africa in 2009 (the head of the ANC has always been its Presidential candidate). In other words, South Africa would still be a source of wealth for mining cartels, using cheap South African labor, or cheap migrant labor of desperate job-seekers from neighboring countries.

The Anglo-Dutch cartel revealed their real intentions in an editorial in the London *Economist* on Dec. 15, before the election, which stated that both candidates, Mbeki and Zuma, were deeply flawed, and that neither should be running the ANC, or the country. “A split in the movement might be welcome,” wrote the *Economist*, “because the country should be moving to a new era of pluralist democracy.” The editorial complained that many in the ANC do not see Mbeki's alleged autocracy as bad, and lamented that their favorite candidates, Tokyo Sexwale and Cyril Ramaphosa, didn't have a chance, because the ANC's authoritarian traditions prevented them from even being considered as candidates.

Ramaphosa and Sexwale have been long-time bitter foes of Mbeki, and darlings of the financier oligarchy. They both played critical roles in the negotiations that determined the path that South Africa would take in the post-apartheid era. When it was clear that Mbeki was going to get the nod

to succeed Mandela, they both left politics, and were made multi-millionaires by the predominantly British-based mining and financial conglomerates, under the cover of the Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) program. This is a kind of affirmative action program in which companies have been selling off chunks of their businesses to black Africans. Special deals are offered on favorable terms, supposedly to compensate for the fact that, under apartheid, black Africans were excluded from the economy. This is really a corrupting game that is played with politicians, whereby white-owned companies hope to get government contracts.

According to one account about Sexwale: “He found one of the leading banks in South Africa, which has virtually given him an open checkbook. And as a consequence of that, he’s been able to put together a number of deals—many, many deals in many different areas of the economy.” Now he is referred to as “Deal-A-Minute” Sexwale, and today his companies are worth about \$500 million. He has become a mining mogul in gold, platinum, and diamonds; but he also has significant interests in banking, engineering, and health care.

The story of Ramaphosa, a labor organizer in the apartheid era, who reportedly became Mandela’s closest advisor during the transition period, is similar.

## Stormclouds of Chaos

The situation in South Africa is now becoming chaotic. Even though he is President until 2009, it will now be next to impossible for Mbeki to continue his continental interventionist policy. There are already calls from the new ANC leadership that he and his Cabinet be recalled, if they don’t toe the line of the new party leadership.

The crisis will be fueled by an 84-page indictment that has been handed down against Zuma, charging him with racketeering in connection with payoffs for an arms deal involving one of his business partners, Shabir Shaik, who was convicted. Following this conviction, Zuma was removed from his position as Vice President by Mbeki in June 2005. Zuma has also been linked to the corrupt British arms manufacturer BAE Systems, with payoffs for procuring arms deals, which connects him to the London financial networks that wanted to put a stop Mbeki from messing up their African “plantation.”

Among the general population, Zuma is not so popular. A poll cited by the *Economist* indicates that half the people in the big cities in South Africa think that Zuma as President of South Africa would be disastrous. In this context, the Anglo-Dutch financiers, in their scramble to come out on top after the ongoing financial blowout, seem to be angling for one of their favorites, Sexwale or Ramaphosa, to become the next President of South Africa.

## LaRouches Led Fight for Development of Africa

*The role of Lyndon LaRouche and Helga Zepp-LaRouche in promoting African economic development goes back more than three decades, beginning in 1974, when LaRouche convened a task force to study the genocidal effects of International Monetary Fund policies on Africa.*

*Over those years, the LaRouches have put forward development programs for the nations of Africa numerous times, including at conferences in Sudan and elsewhere.*

*Here is a partial bibliography of their speeches and writings:*

- “Critique of the Lagos Plan: Stop Club of Rome Genocide in Africa,” from a book-length memorandum by Lyndon LaRouche, circulated in response to the Organization of African Unity’s April 1980 “Lagos Plan of Action” (*EIR*, Jan. 1, 1993).

- LaRouche’s keynote address to a conference, co-sponsored by *EIR*, held in Walluf, Germany, April 1997, on “Peace Through Development in the Great Lakes Region.” LaRouche’s speech was titled, “Viewing Africa’s Current Crisis From the Vantage Point of Universal History” (*EIR*, May 23, 1997).

- Helga Zepp-LaRouche’s speech at the same conference was titled, “By Saving Africa, We Can Save the World” (*EIR*, May 23, 1997).

- The LaRouches visited Khartoum, Sudan in January 2001, one of several trips they have made over the years to the African nation, to address a symposium, co-sponsored by *EIR*, titled “Peace Through Development along the Nile Valley in the Framework of a New, Just World Economic Order. LaRouche gave the keynote on “The New Bretton Woods System: Framework for a New, Just World Economic Order” (*EIR*, Feb. 23, 2001). LaRouche gave a second speech to the concluding panel, headlined, “Dialogue Among Cultures: The Road To Peace” (*EIR*, Feb. 9, 2001).

- Helga Zepp-LaRouche also spoke at the January 2001 Sudan conference on “The Cultural Basis for a Peace Policy” (*EIR*, Feb. 9, 2001).