

groups are set against one another in the struggle to survive. After the severe droughts and famines hit in the 1980s, the previously normal patterns of herdsman and farmers negotiating their access to water, began to change. In impoverished Sudan, which received little meaningful assistance from the West to help resolve the conflicts over water, racial and ethnic bigotry intensified. The continuation of the drought led to increased fighting over diminishing water resources, and as weapons flowed into the area, conditions ripened for the eruption of brutal warfare. Not only in Darfur: Similar kinds of warfare have broken out throughout Sub-Saharan Africa un-

der the extremely oppressive conditions created by the policies of NSSM 200. But the solution to the crisis in Sub-Saharan Africa can never be a military one. Without a state-sponsored investment program for massive infrastructure projects to create more potable water, more gigawatts of electrical power, more hospitals, more schools, and more efficient rail transportation, the conditions for orchestrated deadly conflicts like Darfur will continue.

The immediate danger in the weeks ahead is that the newly elected Democratic members of Congress—even before taking their seats next January—will join a desperate Vice Presi-

LaRouche: Bush and Cheney Plan a New Iraq in Darfur

During his Oct. 31 webcast, leading Democrat and statesman Lyndon LaRouche was asked why he doesn't support military action against Sudan. LaRouche's response, reprinted here, was also issued as a LaRouche PAC leaflet.

First of all, the problem is caused by the United States; the problem of Sudan is caused by the United States. It goes back to the time that, in this case, the current President's father, who may wish to disown the connection, was a Vice President of the United States. And he, with his wife, made a visit to the capital of Sudan, and did some unpleasant things. But he was also involved, as Vice President, in what became known as Iran-Contra. He was a key part in organizing what we call today al-Qaeda, together with the British, because they've got people who are highly religiously motivated in the Arab world, especially in Saudi Arabia, and went to religious people in places such as Sudan and elsewhere, and recruited from Muslim Brotherhood circles, which were religious, people who were enthusiastic for this prospect, which we call al-Qaeda, which was then what the United States organized at the behest of Brzezinski and company earlier, continued by Vice President Bush and by Jimmy Goldsmith of England, and so forth, as what was called the Afghanistan war of the 1980s.

So, in this period, the United States in the person of Vice President Bush at that time, and others, had this grand war going over there, and they used people from the Arab world, particularly religious Arabs, particularly Saudi connections and so forth, to conduct this war in Afghanistan, which we are still experiencing at the present time—what they did then. It was a war on the underbelly of the Soviet Union, which was in a sense a bad idea. We had a better approach to this than they did, to deal with this—the Soviet

Union. So in this process, that happened.

Now, at the time that President Clinton was leaving office—and I think his administration had a very poor comprehension of Africa, in practice. And I think I have a much better comprehension of the problems of Africa—though I'm not perfect on the subject—than he does, still. Though I think his ideas have improved greatly, and I think his Administration served him badly, particularly on the Africa question as in the case of Uganda and so forth; I think he was very badly served by many people in his Administration, in the State Department at that time, and this is part of the problem.

But, I was last physically in Sudan at the end of January of 2001, and I ran into a buzz saw. I was there doing work on the question of water. I'd been there a number of times before. I was very familiar with the problems in the country, and the complexity of these problems, which this problem of Darfur is a reflection of, but a reflection of something else specifically. If you want to deal with the question, you have to deal with it honestly.

First of all, the objective of some people, recognizing that the key to the whole area, from the so-called Lake Victoria (which I think is a name that ought to be changed, to some respectable name), all the way to the Mediterranean Sea, that this area is governed now by a water agreement which involves Egypt, on the measurement of the Nile water. Now, the objective was, the imperialist objectives, were to destroy Egypt. How? If you break the Nile water agreement by splitting off parts of these micro-state creations in this area, then you will break the water agreement, and then what will happen is Egypt will blow up, and the entire Arab world will blow up!

'Bush Is Not Your Friend'

So, looking at these things as isolated human interest things, is a mistake, because it is sophistry; it's ignoring the problem. Now, as I said, I was there in January of 2001. What I ran into was a buzz saw. The Arabs coming out of Saudi Arabia, of Prince Bandar and so forth, told the people

dent Cheney in launching yet another war against an Islamic nation. Cheney's masters are looking for a pretext to create a new asymmetric war as part of their regime change/permanent war strategy. Since some Democrats are more "gung ho" for militarily intervening into Darfur, if more thoughtful heads don't prevail, the Democrats could squander their hard-fought election victory, and end up in their own quagmire in the deserts of Sudan. As LaRouche concluded in his answer to a question, during the Oct. 31 webcast: "People should listen to me, and talk to me a little more about these things, and then they wouldn't make those mistakes."

in Sudan that they had a friend in George Bush, George W. Bush, and the George W. Bush Administration. And I said, No. I said George W. Bush is here to *destroy* your country! He's not your friend. But they said, no, the Clinton Administration made a mess of the place. Bush is going to make it better. And I said, he's going to destroy you. And it happened. It's been destroyed.

Now, this crisis down there is a product of what the Bush Administration has done, and the ignorance on the Africa question on the part of Clinton's own administration. Clinton's own administration made a *mess* of Sudan policy. It was not the cause of the problem, but it made a mess of the whole thing, failing to understand, because of very bad advisors on this question of this area. And, as I said, I think the former President would recognize today that some of his former advisors served him very badly on this question. And this mess is created by Bush, so why don't you clean up the Bush Administration? And then we can settle the Darfur thing.

Yes, it *is* a problem, but it's a problem which is *orchestrated*. You want to treat this thing, you want to solve it? You're *not* going to solve it, not by those methods. You may think you have excellent intentions, but it's not going to work. You don't understand the area. And you have to understand this area, and not just by intelligence reports, you have to understand the *people*, you've got to understand the *history*. You've got to understand Egypt. You've got to look at what some people thought about *Museveni*. You want to understand the problem in Darfur? Look at Museveni! And look at what the Clinton Administration's attitude was on Museveni. That's where mistakes were made. And the problem is, the former President has to look at this this way. You cannot be so attached to the idea of doing a humanistic act, that in the course of doing what is ostensibly with humanistic intention, becomes a contribution to a disaster, again. And that's what the problem is.

People should listen to me, and talk to me a little more about these things, and then they wouldn't make those mistakes.

Beilin in Washington Pushes for Peace Plan

by Jeffrey Steinberg

Yossi Beilin, the head of Meretz Yachad, the leading pro-peace opposition party in Israel, spoke at the New America Foundation in Washington, D.C., on Nov. 9, giving an impassioned and very well-reasoned perspective on a peaceful solution to the Israel-Palestine conflict and the larger Middle East crisis.

Beilin began his presentation by reviewing the deep frustration of pro-peace activists over the current state of affairs. He presented several very concrete initiatives that could move rapidly towards a two-state solution, but first he made the more general argument that the fact that there are weak governments in Israel, Syria, Lebanon, and the Palestinian Authority, should not be held up as an excuse to do nothing. In fact, Beilin argued, weak governments, like Israel's post-Lebanon war Olmert government, or the Palestinian Authority's post-Hamas election Abbas government, have nothing to lose. Therefore, since they have already lost the political support of the mass of their people, why not take a bold initiative for peace?

Beilin pointed out that the Syrian President, Bashar Assad, has made it clear that he wants to negotiate a peace deal with Israel. So far, Prime Minister Ehud Olmert is balking, and has refused to open talks, in part because of pressure from Washington not to negotiate with terrorists. Beilin assailed the idea that there should be preconditions on peace talks, pointing out that former Prime Ministers Yitzhak Rabin, Shimon Peres, and even Benjamin Netanyahu, negotiated without preconditions.

Beilin ridiculed the Bush Administration's refusal to engage in any diplomacy with Syria, and pointed out that Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice's last trip to the region was a total fiasco, because she would not talk with Damascus, Hamas, or Hezbollah.

'No Need to Start From Scratch'

The second half of Beilin's opening remarks were directed at the opportunities for a final settlement. "There is no need to start from scratch," he said, reviewing the series of peace negotiations that followed from the 1991 Madrid peace talks. He said that the most fair and comprehensive agreement was the one worked out by Bill Clinton in the closing months of his Presidency, but that the Bush Road Map and Oslo Accords also offered concrete steps to peace, which he itemized precisely. The third option, which Beilin