

Zimbabwe: U.K. Leads G8 in Spitting on Africa

by David Cherry and Dean Andromidas

With British Prime Minister Gordon Brown taking the lead, the heads of the Group of Eight (G8) nations, meeting July 7-9 in Hokkaido Toyako, Japan, spat upon the African Union's July 1 resolution on Zimbabwe. That resolution called for Zimbabweans to resolve their problems themselves, and for "states and all parties concerned to refrain from any action that may negatively impact on the climate of dialogue." The AU also confirmed its support for the mediation efforts of South African President Thabo Mbeki. But the G8 statement on Zimbabwe of July 8 flatly declares, "We will take further steps, inter alia introducing financial and other measures against those individuals responsible for violence [in Zimbabwe]," and it recommends that the UN Secretary General appoint a special envoy "to support regional efforts to take forward mediation between [Zimbabwe] political parties," a move designed to undercut Mbeki.

South Africa's Deputy Foreign Affairs Minister Aziz Pahad, in a press conference July 4, had put emphasis on the language of the AU resolution, saying, "There is now an African Union decision on the way forward and all other parties (the UN or any other international organizations) must respect the will of the African Union Summit."

The G8 statement claimed, "We deplore ... the absence of appropriate conditions for free and fair voting as a result of [Zimbabwean authorities'] systematic violence, obstruction and intimidation. We do not accept the legitimacy of any government that does not reflect the will of the Zimbabwean people." There is, however, no mention of the effect on "free and fair voting" and on "the will of the Zimbabwean people" of British-inspired economic warfare designed to alienate the people from their government, and of British creation and funding of the opposition party, the Movement for Democratic Change of Morgan Tsvangirai, as a battering ram against the government.

At the G8 meeting, the Zimbabwe issue had first been discussed on the sidelines with a group of seven African heads of state, including Mbeki, who, as Africa's mediator in the Zimbabwean crisis, cautioned the G8 leaders that sanctions would be counterproductive and could lead to civil war. Despite opposition from Brown, President George Bush, and German Chancellor Angela Merkel, Mbeki received the support of the African heads of state, and of Russian President Dmitri Medvedev, Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi, and Japanese Prime Minister Yasuo Fukuda.

Berlusconi said that some countries in the region fear that sanctions "could create a situation of civil war," if they lead to Mugabe's downfall. He added, "South Africa says that it is best to seek an agreement between the President and the leader of the opposition. I am of the same opinion." A spokesman for the Fukuda government made a similar statement. Senior Russian negotiator Alexander Pankin said, "Threatening sanctions is not the best way to settle the issue. We believe there should be negotiations between the parties involved with the participation of African leaders."

What did Brown do to force these governments to join in his insulting statement, despite their stated opposition to sanctions? The London *Times* reports his "shock tactics": pulling aside those who supported Mbeki to show them photos of an atrocity killing allegedly committed by the ruling Zanu-PF party during the recent election campaign. But what of charges that such killings are being done by people trained by former Rhodesian Selous Scouts, and wearing Zimbabwe Army uniforms, so that the killings can be blamed on the ZANU-PF government? Did Brown use other pressures?

Russia Breaks Ranks

For a brief moment, the British were confident that, with Russia on board, they could ram through a UN Security Council resolution imposing an arms embargo on Zimbabwe, along with travel bans and asset freezes on leading individuals. China, they believed, would not veto the resolution, because they wanted to avoid any power plays around its Olympic Games. But Russian President Medvedev, in Hokkaido Toyako July 9, pointed out, correctly, that the statement makes no reference to the UN Security Council: "But there were no statements regarding decisions which should be taken by the UN in particular," he said.

Even though Russia and China ultimately vetoed the U.S.-drafted resolution, it is not a satisfactory outcome. All G8 members showed contempt for the African Union by signing the statement. More important, winning individual battles isn't everything. The British are willing to lose every battle, so long as they win the war. A principled stand is needed.

British screeching about dictatorship and violations of human rights in Zimbabwe is all pretext. They have nothing against authoritarian governments, which they oppose very selectively. Their own government, following the Venetian model, is highly authoritarian, behind the democratic window dressing. They care nothing for the welfare of the Zimbabwe people: Their own policy for Africa is genocide, most clearly stated by Prince Philip's Worldwide Fund for Nature and the Club of Rome.

The weakness of Africa's defense is that African governments accept the issues as falsely defined by the Anglo-Dutch oligarchs, instead of bringing the real issue of British ambitions to control Africa to the fore.