

Sanctions, Foreign Prosecutions Aimed To Sabotage African Crisis-Resolution

by Douglas DeGroot

The City of London-based financial cartel has stepped up its efforts against what it considers to be the critical nations in Africa that must be destroyed, if it is going to realize its goal of preventing China and other Asian nations from helping African nations to develop. If London can prevent Africa from using its natural resources to develop, Africa will be London's private source of raw materials, and a cheap labor preserve.

London's present focus is on two areas: the elimination of Zimbabwe as a nation-state, which will open up South Africa and the rest of southern Africa to be ravaged by the global free-trade dictatorship; and the dismemberment of Sudan, so that it will no longer be a nation that could solve its internal problems created by the British during the colonial period. If Zimbabwe were allowed to solve these problems, it would then be in a position to rapidly develop into a major food supplier for Africa, in addition to being able to aid the development of the rest of the nations in the Horn of Africa.

To accomplish its goal, London is maximizing pressure on both countries, slapping on sanctions and threatening, or actually implementing, judicial proceedings from outside of Africa against both governments. These moves are designed to aggravate internal conflicts, and, in the case of Sudan, to sabotage negotiations which are being conducted to resolve the London-manipulated conflicts, or to prevent new negotiations from being initiated.

Zimbabwe Negotiations Attacked

In the case of Zimbabwe, South African President Thabo Mbeki has been attempting to negotiate a resolution of the political conflict between President Robert Mugabe's Zanu-PF party, and opposition factions that were created as an instrument of London's financial warfare against Zimbabwe. Financial warfare began during the negotiations that led to Zimbabwe's independence in 1980. London made Zimbabwe's independence conditional on the new government agreeing to pay off the debt amassed by the illegal minority regime of Ian Smith in what was then the British colony of Rhodesia, a regime that claimed to have broken with the British, declaring itself independent, but which actually carried out London's wishes from 1965 to 1980.

London ramped up its financial warfare in 1990, with a disastrous International Monetary Fund austerity program,

followed by a complete cutoff of development credit and aid. The moves destroyed the economy and drove a wedge between the suffering population, and the party which had led the country to independence.

On July 21, a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) was signed, which laid out a framework for negotiations between the Zimbabwe government and two opposition groups. This had been painstakingly worked out by Mbeki. Any outside pressure could cause Mugabe's Zanu-PF to pull out of the agreement to negotiate. On the day the MoU was signed, the *New York Times* published an editorial, written before the signing, which revealed the desire of its allies from the City of London financial cartel. The *Times* called for "Mr. Mugabe's swift departure," and made the outrageous statement that if there were no agreement, the United States "should encourage all countries to recognize Mr. Tsvangirai as head of a legitimate government in exile." The editorial also called for sustained international pressure against the government of Zimbabwe.

Morgan Tsvangirai is the leader of the London-backed faction of the opposition Movement for Democratic Change (MDC), which is the larger of the two opposition factions, because of all the support it receives from financier George Soros and other lackeys of London. The smaller MDC faction, which does not benefit from London's support, is also participating in the talks.

Instead of trying to help resolve the conflict in Zimbabwe, on the day after the signing of the MoU, the European Union took the British view, and slapped more sanctions on the country, saying that international pressure on Zimbabwe must be maintained. The U.S. followed on July 25, when President Bush signed an Executive Order expanding U.S. economic sanctions.

The same day that the EU imposed more sanctions, Russian President Dmitri Medvedev pointed out that the signing of the MoU and the impending start of talks justified Moscow's July 11 veto of a British-instigated effort to get the United Nations Security Council to pass a resolution calling for UN sanctions against Zimbabwe. He stated that Russia's goal was to calm the situation so that negotiations in the country could proceed.

The day after the EU imposed new sanctions, Angolan Foreign Minister Joao Miranda attacked the move: "The EU

should lift all sanctions on the leaders of Zimbabwe as soon as possible.” Miranda, whose government is one of the strongest allies of Zimbabwe in the Southern African Development Community (SADC), emphasized that the sanctions posed a danger to the success of the talks: “There is no reason to justify the maintenance of these sanctions. All obstacles liable to endanger the progress of negotiations should be removed.”

Following the guidelines laid out in the MoU, negotiations between the Zimbabwe government and the two opposition factions began in South Africa on July 24. On that day, the London *Times* reported that the Russian and Chinese vetoes of much tougher sanctions against Zimbabwe had led to Tsvangirai toning down his position, and agreeing to sign the MoU, to participate in the talks.

The day after the MoU was signed, Kenyan Prime Minister Raila Odinga advocated London’s position of not taking Mbeki’s negotiation process seriously, saying that Tsvangirai should be the head of the government. Odinga was speaking at an event at the Houses of Parliament in London that was hosted by the Royal Institute for International Affairs (Chatham House). The position of prime minister was created for Odinga after three months of London-manipulated violence killed 1,500 people in Kenya.

In sharp contrast to what Odinga said in London, on the day the MoU was signed, Mugabe declared: “Our having signed this MoU is a serious matter. . . . We must act as Zimbabweans” and “cut off whatever were influences on us from Europe or the United States.” He added, “There will be no need for us to call for Europe to impose sanctions,” a reference to Tsvangirai’s calls for sanctions against his own country. “Let’s move forward and start on what Professor Mutambara [the head of the smaller MDC faction] has been calling one vision for Zimbabwe, singing one national anthem, flying one flag,” Mugabe concluded.

Further complicating Mbeki’s task, it was announced on July 24 that efforts are under way by self-proclaimed human rights groups to bring Mugabe and other Zanu-PF leaders before the International Criminal Court (ICC), or before some other court that would be set up in Zimbabwe by groups from outside of Africa. The threat of such prosecutions could blow up the negotiations, or, minimally, make Mbeki’s negotiating task much more difficult.

ICC Seeks To Destabilize Sudan

On July 14, ICC Prosecutor Luis Moreno-Ocampo called for an arrest warrant to be issued for Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir, charging him with war crimes and responsibility for the Darfur conflict. This move was welcomed by the numerous London-manipulated Darfur rebel factions, and will make that region still more ungovernable. In addition, this attack on Bashir could cause the South to question whether to adhere to its agreement with the Sudan government in the North, which ended the years-long civil war between the two.

The government and the South agreed in 2005 to stop the fighting, and set up a procedure to work out a long-term solution to the North-South conflict.

African nations and the Arab League have uniformly denounced the ICC move, and see the charges against President Bashir as merely a tool by major powers to attack the sovereignty of Sudan, and to achieve their political goals of undermining the Khartoum government. Sudan has decided to set up a Human Rights Court to try alleged human rights abuses, which will be monitored by the Arab League, the UN, and the African Union (AU), according to Hisham Yussef, chief of staff for Arab League Secretary-General Amr Moussa, according to AFP July 23.

Another effort to throw the Darfur situation further out of control is that to cripple the joint UN/AU peacekeeping force in Darfur, by pushing the deputy force commander, Rwanda’s Gen. Karake Karenzi, out of his position. In another case of a court from outside of Africa, intervening against a sovereign country, Spanish Judge Fernando Merelles issued warrants against 40 members of the Rwandan military, including General Karenzi, last February, saying that they are guilty of war crimes. This charge is being used as the pretext not to renew Karenzi’s appointment. The UN has delayed renewing Karake’s contract, which came up for renewal last year, because Rwandan opposition groups based outside the country, and Human Rights Watch, have called for it not to be renewed.

The competence of Karenzi is not in question. Yves Soro-kobi, the deputy spokesman of the UN Secretary General, told the BBC that General Karenzi has performed with “excellence” as second in command of the 10,000-plus UN-AU force, according to a Rwanda News Agency report July 25.

The Rwandan government has rejected a UN request that Karenzi be replaced by another Rwandan, and has threatened to pull its 3,000 peacekeepers out of Darfur, if Karenzi is not reappointed. Since Rwanda accounts for one-third of the present strength of the force, this would render the peacekeeping force—which is already much too small—all but useless in preventing anti-government rebel pawns in Darfur from feeding into the City of London policy to dismantle the nation of Sudan.

At the African Union summit in Egypt which began June 30, the heads of state requested the chairperson of the AU Commission to set up a meeting with the EU “to find a lasting solution to this problem and in particular to ensure that those [Spanish] warrants are withdrawn and are not executable in any country.” The summit unanimously decreed: “Those warrants shall not be executed in the African Union member States,” because the political nature of the charges is a clear violation of the sovereignty of Africa nations, according to a July 6 report in the *New Times*. The AU Presidents also called for the issue to be raised at the UN General Assembly. Interpol has also said that the warrants lack merit, and should not be carried out.