

## British offensive on Sudan hits snag, lies exposed

by Muriel Mirak Weissbach

On April 26, the United Nations Security Council rammed through a resolution, imposing diplomatic and political sanctions on Sudan. The resolution passed with the support of the United Kingdom, United States, and France, among the Permanent Five, but Russia and China both abstained. Rotating members of the Security Council, many of whom had balked at sanctions, fell into line, under massive pressure from the United Kingdom and Madeleine Albright, the U.S. ambassador at the UN.

Although the vote signals a serious escalation in the crusade against the strategically key nation in eastern Africa, it falls short of the expectations of the crusaders. Agencies of British intelligence, like Christian Solidarity International and Amnesty International, which have churned out voluminous "reports" on alleged violations of human rights in Sudan, to motivate such Security Council action, expected that body to impose far more wide-ranging sanctions, much earlier.

### British orchestrated gang rape exposed

On Jan. 31, the first step in that direction had been taken when the UN passed Resolution 1044, threatening sanctions within 60 days, unless the Sudanese government in Khartoum "handed over" three Egyptians suspected of involvement in the June 26, 1995 assassination attempt against Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak, who were presumed to be on Sudanese soil. After two months had passed, the British thought they could put through the second resolution automatically. Instead, tremendous resistance emerged, even among those countries, like Egypt, that had been selected to throw the first stone.

The Egyptian government, after having authored a draft

for sanctions, realized that its country would be the first to suffer, if an arms embargo were imposed on Sudan. As Egyptian Foreign Minister Amr Moussa put it, an arms embargo against Khartoum would give the rebel forces the upper hand, enhancing their bid to secede, and initiate a breakup of the nation. That process, in turn, would jeopardize Egyptian security. Therefore, Mubarak told reporters on April 10, his country would accept anything *but* an arms embargo. At the same time, important nations of the non-aligned sector such as Indonesia, Malaysia, and Nigeria, received briefings from Sudanese government officials on the strategic dangers inherent in the UN move. Indonesia made known that it objected to the very mechanism used in the UN, whereby the Permanent Five members of the Security Council essentially dictate law.

In its original form, the draft resolution contemplated a wide range of sanctions, from diplomatic and political measures, to a trade embargo, an aviation ban on all aircraft under Sudanese license, and an arms embargo. In its final form, the resolution imposes only political and diplomatic sanctions. This means that Sudanese diplomatic missions are to be reduced in size, and the movement of diplomats curtailed.

### Sudan plays LaRouche card

The measure taken April 26 carried an air of hysteria with it. It was as if the Security Council had decided to force through a vote on whatever it could, regardless of how far short it fell of their original intentions. One week before, on April 20, two Sudanese government representatives joined Lyndon LaRouche on the podium, at a seminar in Washing-

ton, D.C., to expose the lies behind the anti-Sudan crusade. Abdel Mahmoud N. Al-Koronky, the press counselor at the Sudanese embassy in London, and Angelo Beda, just named as a member of the new cabinet, as Minister of Public Service and Administrative Reform, presented devastating evidence to refute charges that Sudan has been harboring terrorism and condoning slavery. (See *EIR*, May 3, p. 57.)

On the following day, news broke that one of the three Egyptian suspects whom the UN had asserted were on Sudanese soil, had surfaced in Afghanistan, to give an interview. The interview, carried in the Arabic daily based in London, *Al Hayat*, was reported as well by Reuters. In it, Mustafa Hamza, the suspect in question, documents how he and his accomplices entered Ethiopia, to stage the assassination attempt against Mubarak on June 26, 1995. The assailants entered Ethiopia from Pakistan, two of them via Sudan, and with visas issued by the Ethiopian embassy in Khartoum! Furthermore, Mustafa Hamza defines the clear lines of disagreement that his afghansi terrorist group, Gamaa al-Islamiya, has drawn with the Islamic government of Sudan. (See interview below.)

Hamza's statements to the authoritative Arabic daily created some embarrassment for the British and their colleagues, notably Madeleine Albright, which may be one contributing factor to the haste displayed by the Security Council to pass a resolution—any resolution. Now, it is on the record, that the allegations of harboring terrorists, on which the sanctions were motivated, are baseless.

That the grounds for UN action are flimsy, to say the least, is underlined as well, by the fact that the trial, now going on in Adis Abeba, Ethiopia, against three other assailants involved in the assassination attempt, is being conducted behind closed doors. As Al-Koronky emphasized in discussions with Washington policymakers, such secrecy does not speak well for the accusers: If, indeed, the three men on trial were involved in the plot against Mubarak, and, if Sudan were behind their machinations, why the secrecy? Not only is the trial secret, but the defendants have not been allowed to have defense attorneys, although two prominent Egyptian lawyers had offered their services. Furthermore, Sudan, the real party under accusation, has not been allowed to attend the proceedings.

It is to be expected that further such outrageous violations of human rights will be exposed in the immediate future, further undermining the fraudulent case that the British have brought against Sudan. The true story on what is behind the allegations of slavery, is now out. The identity and political motivations of the British intelligence fronts mounting the crusade have been made public, in unmistakable terms, in Washington. Members of the Congress have been duly informed. Thus, there is no guarantee that the British will succeed over the next two months in organizing a broad coalition to impose tougher sanctions against Sudan.

Yet, the British are not likely to give up. On the contrary,

they will probably accelerate their campaign, for fear that the game will be up, before they reach their aim. London's strategy for Sudan, behind the drive for sanctions, is to hamstring the central government militarily, while arming the rebels in the south, and opening up new fronts to the east, through Ethiopia and Eritrea. As Baroness Caroline Cox of Christian Solidarity International has made known, the policy is to spread the war to the north, overthrow the government by violence, and break up Sudan into several micro-states.

### **'Political Charter' signed with ex-rebels**

Now, even in the military aspect, things look bleak for the British. On April 10, the Khartoum government announced that a political charter had been signed with two of the three rebel leaders in the insurrection, Riak Machar Teny Dhugon of the South Sudan Independence Movement (SSIM) and Kerubino Kuanyin, chairman of the Southern Peoples Liberation Army of the Bahr al-Ghazal region. Dughon is a Nuer tribal leader and Kuanyin, the original founder of the Sudanese Peoples Liberation Army (SPLA), is a Dinka. The charter lays the basis for agreement with the remaining rebel group under John Garang, also a Dinka. The charter commits the signators to defend the unity of the country, while assuring complete freedom of religion and culture (see *Documentation*). News of the agreement is certain to have a demoralizing effect on the remaining rebel forces. Shortly after the breakthrough had been announced, rumors began to circulate, that Garang, head of the SPLA, had been wounded in fighting and was hospitalized in Nairobi, Kenya. Later, rumors that the "historic" leader of the insurrection had died, were dispelled by reports he had given a live radio interview.

Peace *could* be achieved quickly, as the British know full well. That is the perspective they are desperately seeking to sabotage. But time may be running out, even for London.

---

## **Documentation**

---

*Declaration signed by Sudan government and southern rebels: "Political Charter, April 1996":*

This charter has been concluded between the: 1) Government of Sudan; 2) The South Sudan Independence Movement/Army (SSIM/A); and 3) Sudan Peoples' Liberation Movement (SPLM/A Bahrel Ghazal Group—B.G.G.)

In recognition of the series of previous peace talks, the parties have pledged to put an end to the ongoing civil war in the Sudan. They agreed on the provisions mentioned below in this charter:

1. To resolve the conflict of Sudan through peaceful and political means.
2. The unity of the Sudan with its known boundaries,

shall be preserved, its entity shall be secured against all internal and external threats. The parties shall endeavor to keep peace, justice and supremacy of values of right, goodness and virtue.

3. After full establishment of peace, stability and a reasonable level of social development in the south, and at the end of the interim period, a referendum will be conducted by the people of the southern Sudan to determine their political aspirations.

4. Recognizing the constitutional development, implementation of the federal system and political practice based on the values of participatory democracy, the two parties shall endeavor to boost the progress in these fields in the light of changing situations.

5. Citizenship shall be the basis of rights and duties in furtherance of the values of justice, equity, freedom and human rights.

6. *Sharia* and custom shall be the sources of legislation. However, states may enact legislation complementary to the federal law in matters peculiar to those states.

7. Cultural diversity in Sudan is recognized; Sudanese people are encouraged to freely express the values of this diversity.

8. Freedom of religion and belief shall be observed and a suitable atmosphere shall be maintained for practicing worship, *dawa*, proselytization and preaching. No citizen shall be coerced to embrace any faith or religion.

9. Social development is an extreme priority for the achievement of which the government shall plan for confidence-building and expediting the process of alleviating of poverty, ignorance and illiteracy. The states shall also work for the spread of knowledge and achieving self-sufficiency.

10. Power and national wealth shall equitably be shared for the benefit of the citizens in the country. The details shall be worked out by the two parties.

11. A coordination council shall be formed between the southern states for better implementation of this agreement.

12. The two parties will work together for stability and improvement of living conditions in the affected areas according to the provisions of the subsequent Peace Agreement. Both sides shall carry the duty of implementing the security arrangement, resettlement, reconstruction, development and preservation of rights and duties.

13. Sudan shall interact with African and Arab nations and the world community on the basis of the effective Sudanese identity for the benefit of Sudan.

14. Sudanese in general, and the southerners in particular shall be mobilized to rally behind and support the subsequent peace agreement.

Signed, 1) Maj. Gen. (Brig.) Al Zubair Mohammed Salih, First Vice President of the Republic of Sudan; 2) Cdr. Dr. Riak Machar Teny Dhugon Chairman of NLC SSIM and Commander-in-Chief of SSIA; 3) Cdr. Kerubino Kuanyin,

Chairman of SPLM/A (B.G.G.)

Dated 10 April 1996, Khartoum

### Interview with assassin Mustafa Hamza

*Mustafa Hamza is a fugitive Egyptian terrorist suspect wanted in the June 26, 1995 assassination attempt in Adis Abeba, Ethiopia against Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak. According to the London-based Arabic newspaper Al Hayat, he contacted their Afghanistan correspondent and offered an interview, which was published on April 21. In that interview, he said that Sudan had nothing to do with the assassination attempt against Mubarak. Hamza, known in the interview as Abu Hazim, claims to be in Konor state in Afghanistan under the control of the "Gamaat Al Dawa for Koran and Sunna." Al Hayat reported on the interview: "He confessed that Al Gamaa al Islamiya has carried out the foiled assassination attempt and asserted that no country or organization was linked to the attempt. He confirmed that 75% of those who took part in the attempt came from Pakistan and hold passports from an Arab state, while one or two only arrived at the Ethiopia Embassy in Khartoum. . . . Hamza stressed the deep differences between the ruling Islamic Front in the Sudan and his group Gamaa al Islamiya. He accused the Sudanese government of a distorted and deviated application of Islam."*

*Here are excerpts from the interview:*

**Q:** Could you introduce yourself. . . ?

**Hamza:** My name is Mustafa Ahmed Hassan Hamza, one of the Gamaa al Islamiya in Egypt. Born in [Egypt], B.Sc. of Agricultural Science, U. of Cairo 1979. I spent seven years in prison in the case of El Jihad Organization which was accused of assassination of ex-President Anwar El Sadat. I stayed one year in Egypt and then travelled abroad. I am 38 years old now. . . . I went to Pakistan and Afghanistan where I stayed for three and a half years and I contributed to the sacred war with many Afghanistan groups.

**Q:** In the assassination attempt of President Hosni Mubarak, how did those who executed it reach Ethiopia. . . ?

**Hazim:** We have issued some press releases concerning this issue, in which we clarified all the matters. I now say we haven't any relations with any state or organization in the execution of this attempt. The Egyptian Gamaa al Islamiya and its members are the ones who have done the whole operation: planning, plotting, and executing. Every thing concerning the operation from A to Z is the work of the members of the Gamaa al Islamiya. What is alleged of the involvement of others in the operation is baseless lies. I believe the Egyptian and Ethiopian security services and the FBI found out these confirmed facts. There are certain political matters which control them and we have nothing to do with it. All this is found in the investigations which took place in Ethiopia with the three brothers who are in custody there.

One of the two brothers [i.e., collaborators] came through Sudan from Pakistan. This is evident in the airport and is known by Ethiopian security. Seventy-five percent of the people came from Pakistan and one or two came from Sudan. The main objective is to execute the operation. . . .

**Q:** How does Gamaa al Islamiya view the government of Sudan?

**Hazim:** Our general policy is to support whoever implements Islam, but we have deeply rooted disagreement with the government of Sudan. We are fundamentalists in our belief methodology and movement, and they (the Sudanese) are far from the fundamentalist line, they call for reform of Islamic jurisprudence and deviated from established Islamic traditions. The disagreement in such issues makes the rapprochement with them difficult. The interests which govern them is far from the established Islamic teaching. Their implementation of Islam is disfigured and contains clear divergence. When I visit Sudan I don't see any sign of Islam in the daily life of people; there was only press propaganda for jihad in southern Sudan. The Sudanese deal with every matter according to their interest; one time they ally themselves with Egypt and another time with the Eritrean President Asyass Aforgi. Their position concerning the Eritrean Jihad is clear. They sold them for Afwerki who later turned against Sudan.

Concerning the United States, we are clear, they don't want Islam to rule, but the Sudanese show their desire to dialogue with the United States. I think their position concerning Israel is ambiguous. If a treaty between Syria and the Zionist state is signed, they will accept it, which is completely unacceptable, illogical, and contrary to the *Sharia*.

**Q:** Because of you and because of Gamaa al Islamiya, an embargo will be imposed on Sudan. How do you feel about this?

**Hazim:** I have no relation to this matter. The brothers wanted to get rid of Mubarak because he constitutes a basic obstacle in the face of the international Islamic movements. This was the major consideration which governed us and we have no relation to any political disagreement with any regimes which victimize the Sudanese people.

We have no brothers in Sudan, as to the other brother, he is in another state, he will appear soon, and there is no third person. Through our dialogue and speech we want to prove that the Sudanese people are not involved in the matter. We are ready to lift any injustice to which it might be subjected. We absolve ourselves before God from any responsibility that the Sudanese have no link to us. . . .

**Q:** Where were you during the Adis Abeba operation? . . .

**Hazim:** During the operation I was in Afghanistan, I was moving between Afghanistan and Pakistan, I wasn't in Sudan during that time.

## FARC, UN out to get Colombia's Gen. Bedoya

by Maximiliano Londoño Penilla

Maximiliano Londoño, President of the Ibero-American Solidarity Movement (MSIA) of Colombia and well-known opponent of the drug cartels, issued the following statement on April 29, in response to a pattern of attacks from varied quarters against the Commander of the Colombian Army, Gen. Harold Bedoya.

Londoño, a frequent contributor to *EIR*, visited Washington, D.C. in February 1996, to warn that hemispheric security, and the survival of Colombia as a nation, required the drug cartel-run Samper Pizano regime be decertified by the Clinton administration. The administration did decertify Colombia, and the Samper regime is reeling from that decision—but has yet to leave power itself.

Now, Londoño has issued a warning that international forces allied with the cartels, are setting up one of the firmest opponents of those cartels inside Colombia, Army Commander Bedoya, for elimination—including possible *physical* elimination.

The flurry of attacks against General Bedoya was ostensibly provoked by his April 12 statement rejecting proposals that international troops be deployed into the Urabá region of Colombia. He warned: "If we continue to permit international [interests] to tell us how we should protect our borders, we shall lose Urabá, just as occurred with Panama. Any country in the world would be interested in the Urabá region, and if we Colombians play their game, we'll lose the Atrato Canal," a reference to the proposals for an interoceanic canal in the region. As *EIR* exposed in its Nov. 10, 1995 Special Report, "New Terror International Targets the Americas," a British-sponsored separatist plot is well-advanced in the Urabá region.

### Londoño's statement

*We publish Londoño's warning here because, should the forces targetting Bedoya succeed, the current political and military impasse in Colombia—where neither the cartels nor their nationalist opponents have had the strength to finish off the other—could be irrevocably tipped in favor of the drug cartels. Subheads have been added.*

Because he is a decided defender of national sovereignty, and because he opposes the anti-national and imperial proposal to