

sions of Rwanda, Uganda, and Burundi against Zaire. This week, Baroness Chalker arrived in Nairobi in an obvious effort to whip the Kenyan President into line.

### The war against Sudan

The war against Sudan is already spreading diplomatically into the Arab world and the Mideast. Egypt and Sudan have both accused *Israel* of being directly involved in logistically supplying and directing the war effort from Eritrea and Ethiopia, including construction of Israeli bases. The war against Sudan poses a direct threat to Egypt's national security, as Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak has stated point-blank. While publicly supporting the Sudanese political opposition organized around Baroness Caroline Cox's National Democratic Alliance, on Jan. 26, the Egyptian government daily *Al Ahram* warned the NDA to sever its links to John Garang and the Sudanese People's Liberation Army and the attacks on Sudan from Ethiopia and Eritrea.

Diplomatically, *Iran* has come out in support of Sudan, while NDA chief Sadig al-Mahdi has won support from *Kuwait*. The Arab League has issued a statement in support of Sudan against foreign aggression, and *Saudi Arabia* is likely to follow suit.

Further on the horizon, the French-speaking *Central African Republic*, wedged between Zaire and Sudan, has been under intense destabilization. *Niger* and *Congo* are also under threat of internal instability. *Zambia*, whose government is resisting turning over its immense copper fields to London's Anglo American, is being treated to credit cut-offs.

In sum, there are a total of ten African countries known to be directly involved in the fighting in East Africa, another six reported to be involved or supplying arms, and another four African countries under destabilization as a result of the British onslaught. The onslaughts against Sudan and Zaire thus threaten to unleash a tidal wave of bloodletting in Africa, which will continue to widen—unless the United States breaks with British policy and acts to end London's genocidal wars.

### The unsavory Museveni

For the first time, Museveni also ran into protests against his presence in the United States. His supporters received a shock when two Schiller Institute spokesmen challenged the Ugandan President during a seminar at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington. At this location, former Marxist Museveni lectured on the glories of the free enterprise system, which, he omitted to mention, has plunged the life expectancy of his country to the lowest levels since British rule. As the *Washington Post* reported on Feb. 5, this time, Museveni "did not move when two women accused him . . . of 'mass murder,' saying his troops were crossing Central African borders to keep refugees out. Museveni, who has been accused of sending Ugandan troops into neighboring Zaire and Sudan and assisting Rwanda,

acknowledged that there are problems in those countries and 'they have to be addressed.' "

Outside the seminar, a rally, complete with a replica of Queen Elizabeth II, leafletted attendees with LaRouche's warning to the Clinton administration, and a chronology of Museveni's wars of invasion in Africa.

Museveni was again greeted with a rally against him, painting him as a mass murderer for the British as he arrived at the National Prayer Breakfast meeting on Feb. 6, which was addressed by President Bill Clinton. Rally signs read: "Museveni Responsible for 1.6 Million Dead," "Museveni Get Out of Sudan, Zaire, Rwanda, Burundi, and the U.S.A.," "LaRouche Says No British American Special Relationship," and "Museveni's Idea of Black Napoleon Is a Pipe Dream."

This is the first time Museveni has been appropriately greeted in the United States. The leaflet handed out outside the CSIS seminar against Museveni reprinted Museveni's quote from the September 1994 issue of *Atlantic Monthly*, "I have never blamed the whites for colonizing Africa; I have blamed these whites for taking slaves. If you are stupid, you should be taken a slave." Museveni admitted to this statement, when confronted during the seminar. Such sentiments explain why the British oligarchy has found him so handy a partner in Africa. But such sentiments must also categorically deny him a welcome in the United States.

## SSIM blasts Garang as 'bloody dictator'

*The following statement was issued by the Secretary for External Affairs of the South Sudan Independence Movement (SSIM), Costello Garang Ring Lual, on Jan. 25, in Germany, and presented the same day to the Washington, D.C., forum on Africa sponsored by the FDR-PAC. It is entitled, "The Position of SSIM and the Other Southern Charter Signatories Concerning the Ongoing Events in Southern Blue Nile and Eastern Sudan."*

By signing the Political Charter with the GOS (Government of Sudan) on the 10th of April 1996, the SSIM and its other Southern allies made their position crystal clear on how to solve the South-North conflict. A high-ranking SSIM delegation, headed by Secretary for External Affairs Costello Garang Ring Lual, toured the U.S.A. from the 20th of June to the 20th of August, followed by the European countries listed below, to explain the position of the Southern Charter's signatories.

The delegation visited Norway, France, Belgium, Hol-

land, Italy, Switzerland, and Germany; and thereafter, two leading members of the Movement, Joseph Malual Dong and Dr. Stephen Abraham Yar, who accompanied the Secretary for External Affairs on his visit to the U.S.A., proceeded to Great Britain to present the position of the Southern Charter's signatories to the British government.

Our position, which we still hold, was that:

1. We were willing to take the opportunity of a negotiated peace settlement. We were not going to engage in speculations regarding the intentions [of the GOS] as the good or bad will of GOS would be proved at the roundtable. The Charter, for SSIM and its other Southern signatories which we represented, is like going to marriage where one does not ask whether it is going to work or not, but one goes into it with all optimism and intention to make it work.

2. The ruling Islamic-oriented politicians in Khartoum are realistic and intelligent enough to acknowledge the fact that Sudan is multiracial, multi-ethnic, multicultural, and multireligious. No pure "Islamic theocratic political system," as feared by the West, could be established all over the country, under such circumstances with large, non-Islamic groups in the South and elsewhere also aspiring for their own cultural and religious identities. Our cooperation with the current GOS would give the ruling groups a sense of security and would, in the long run, also dilute some of the current ideological outlooks, which are considered by the West and the South alike as "Islamic fundamentalist." The right of self-determination for the People of South Sudan is the price we demanded, and are going to get, for the ongoing cooperation. If the ruling Islamic-orientated groups reneged on it—we don't believe they would—we will stop all sorts of cooperation.

3. For the SSIM-SSIA and its allies, the oppositional northern political parties in the NDA [National Democratic Alliance] are not a better alternative to the current GOS, as far as the South is concerned, for several obvious reasons:

a) The Umma Party and the DUP [Democratic Unionist Party] are like the NIF [National Islamic Front] Islamic parties which intend to create an Islamic state in Sudan. They have for several years ruled the country and were not able to solve the ongoing conflict.

b) It was the former Prime Minister and Umma leader Sadiq al-Mahdi who introduced the arming of northern tribes during the time of his premiership in order to use them against the SPLM/SPLA. Robbery became the order of the day and the South was devastated as a result of the Umma-DUP Southern policies.

c) The fact that the SSIM-SSIA was rejected for NDA membership and the very fact that the northern oppositional parties were collaborating with a bloody Southern dictator, namely, the SPLM-SPLA leader, Dr. John Garang, shows that these parties are for sure no more democratic than those ruling in Khartoum, as the NDA tends to openly claim.

4. The SSIM-SSIA would see to it that there is linkage

between the solution of Southern Sudanese problems and those of the neighboring countries and will address Egyptian fears concerning the flow of the Nile water, which is, after all, not used in Southern Sudan for irrigation, since the South enjoys enough rainfall.

5. The U.S.A. and its Western allies should encourage reconciliation of Southern rebel groups and abstain from endorsing the SPLM-SPLA as the "main resistance" movement. The SPLM-SPLA leader was portrayed by the delegation as a bloody dictator who has misused Southern Nationalism for personal ends. No Southern Sudanese is fighting for the creation of what the SPLM-SPLA leader terms "democratic, secular, and united New Sudan." If the current conflict could be solved peacefully and through a negotiated settlement, there is no need, from a Southern viewpoint, for the continuation of war, even if the whole country is temporarily being ruled by an Islamic political grouping.

6. To underline the fact that the SPLM-SPLA leader is a dictator with no respect for even the lives of the people he claims to be fighting to liberate, a list of leading Southern politicians who were extrajudicially murdered in cold blood by the SPLM-SPLA was handed over to the personalities met by the delegation during the visits. Documented on the list are, for example, the names of the following Southern leaders who were either first detained and then murdered by the SPLM-SPLA security agents, or just shot in cold blood:

1) Joseph Odubo, 2) Martin Magier Gai, 3) Martin Makur Aleyou, 4) Martin Kogiburo, 5) Joseph Malanth, 6) Benjamin Bol Akok, 7) James Gatwec, 8) John Jok Gai, 9) James Gaijiath Thoat, 10) Dol Manguok Jr., and many more.

From the above-mentioned point of view, the SSIM-SSIA and its Southern Charter Allies categorically condemn the ongoing so-called "NDA Offensive" in the Southern Blue Nile and eastern Sudan, because the only visible, logical aim behind it is denying a chance to the Peace Charter and, hence, denying a peaceful solution of the North-South conflict. The situation is being intentionally complicated by making out of the North-South political and social conflict an ideological, anti-Islamic war, but at the same time, the SPLM/SPLA leader, well known for his opportunistic tendencies, is allying himself with the traditional northern Islamic parties, which he termed in 1983 the "enemies of the People." Garang stated that the objection of his "revolution" was to "free the Sudanese masses" from the domination of the Mahdi and Mirghani family, whom he, together with those in Khartoum and Gezira, termed "the ruling clique." Whether in Southern Blue Nile, Nuba Mountains, eastern or southern Sudan, it is the Southern and the Nuba youth who are being used as cannon-fodder by the NDA. The traditional Islamic leaders in the Umma Party and the DUP are not, and would never be, willing to send their daughters and sons to go and struggle, fight, and die for the "freedom and democracy" they emptily and loudly claim to be striding forward toward.