

Sudan's President Bashir Defends His Nation's Sovereignty

by Lawrence K. Freeman

“Sudan will not become the first nation of Africa to be re-colonialized,” Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir told a multi-city video-conference with the news media on Nov. 27. In an unusual format Bashir, speaking from Khartoum, simultaneously addressed audiences in eight capital cities, including Beirut, Berlin, Cairo, London, Paris, Pretoria, Moscow, and Washington, and took questions, many of them hostile, for over an hour and half.

Leading up to this press briefing, had been weeks of speculation about what kind of military force would be deployed into the Darfur region of Sudan, under the pretext of stopping genocide. In fact, to all who understand the horrendous conditions under which hundreds of millions live in sub-Saharan Africa, the real genocidalists are the International Monetary Fund, and the Synarchist financiers who are looting the continent of its valuable natural resources, and radically reducing the population through the spread of famine, war, and disease.

The most precious commodity in Darfur, whose scarcity has been a constant factor in the conflict there for over a quarter of a century, is not oil, but *water*. And all the crocodile tears shed out of concern for the suffering in Darfur, have not led to an increase of one single drop of potable water for the farmers and herdsman fighting over access to water holes in this vast, arid, and desolate area.

No Foreign Occupation

With the current mandate for the deployment of approximately 7,000 African Union (AU) troops set to expire at the end of the year,* there has been a frantic effort to get the government of Sudan to agree to a deployment of more than 21,000 United Nations troops with a mandate, known as Chapter VII, which allows outside military intervention into Sudan, including potentially against the armed forces of Sudan. A key clause of UN Resolution 1706, which was adopted by the Security Council in August of this year, “invites” the government of Sudan to accept this UN military force. Bashir made it abundantly clear at this international press conference, and correctly so, that such a robust UN force would be tantamount to a foreign occupation. He told those assembled,

* It has just been announced that as a result of a meeting of the African Union in Abuja, an agreement with Sudan has been reached to extend the AU deployment for another six months until the end of June 2007.

that he would not allow a “Bremer II” in Sudan—referring to the disastrous and deadly occupation of Iraq by Henry Kissinger’s and George Shultz’s stooge, Paul Bremer.

Instead, Bashir proposed that the UN apply a Chapter VIII mandate to dealing with Darfur. This allows the UN to assign a regional or continental force, funded and logistically supported by the UN itself. It is clear to any rational person familiar with the culture and conditions of Darfur, that only the AU, led and deployed by Africans, will be acceptable to all the contentious parties participating in this conflict.

Bashir has legitimate reason to be concerned about foreign forces deploying into Sudan. Members of the anti-Sudan lobby (who completely screwed up U.S. policy towards Sudan during the Presidency of Bill Clinton), such as Susan Rice and Anthony Lake, have, along with Congressman Donald Payne (D-N.J.), called on the Bush Administration to bomb the Port of Sudan. Other Washington, D.C. “think-tanks” have advocated the deployment of an advanced U.S. military team to operate inside Sudan in the so-called war on terrorism, but not under the control of the government of Sudan.

It appears that UN Resolution 1706 is dead. Andrew Natsios, U.S. special envoy to Sudan, implied that there was a “Plan B,” but has so far failed to articulate any alternative, if in fact one exists. Any idea of deploying UN troops without the agreement of the Sudanese government would result in a new escalation of asymmetric warfare in the Horn of Africa. Natsios also made clear that a NATO deployment into Darfur is off the table, because of a shortage of NATO troops, which are bogged down in the war in Afghanistan. Precisely because the equivalent of a foreign invasion could lead to a conflagration, there are behind-the-scenes efforts by countries genuinely concerned about the Darfur crisis, to head off such a military invasion by trying to initiate a new UN resolution. Others directly involved are looking for a peace agreement to come out of discussions taking place in Addis Abeba, Ethiopia.

One month after the Darfur Peace Agreement, which was signed in May in Abuja, Nigeria, by only the Minni Minawi faction of the Sudan Liberation Movement, the pact quickly fell apart; the National Redemption Front was formed, consisting of the three opposing rebel groups: Sudan Liberation Movement/Army, Sudan Federal Democratic Alliance, and Justice and Equality Movement.



EIRNS/Lawrence Freeman

Sudanese President Omar Hassan al-Bashir gives a press briefing on Nov. 27, by video-conference.

Those with intimate knowledge of the conflict and the area, know that it will take an AU force several times larger than the current 7,000 troops, to end the killing, because of the proliferation of rebel militias, and the out-of-control Janjaweed militia. And this must be accompanied by a policy of accelerated infrastructural economic development of the entire region.

It Is Not Simply About Darfur

The conflict in Darfur is ugly and deadly, but, contrary to the naive and simplistic views of many of the supporters of the “save Darfur” campaign, this is not genocide by Arabs against Africans. As is the case throughout Africa, foreign powers outside of the continent orchestrate these deadly conflicts by supplying the various groups with weapons and material support. To find out who else is involved, examine the influence of the British and the French through their long historical relations with Chad, and the Central African Republic, which share the western border of the Darfur region of Sudan, along with Libya. These so-called rebel groups are manipulated, and used as tools of foreign financial interests for the evil purpose of destroying already weakened African nations. Their intention is to dismember Sudan by dividing the country into ethnic, racial, and religious separate entities, which will fight each other, allowing their real enemy, the financier and commodity cartels, to loot and destroy the nation.

It is precisely this colonial practice which aims to ensure that no African nation will ever achieve the true sovereign economic independence necessary to uplift its people from their current inhuman conditions of existence, which must be

overturned by international action, most emphatically led by what has traditionally been the world’s major anti-colonial power, the United States.

As Lyndon LaRouche commented on the Darfur crisis during his Oct. 31 webcast: “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 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.”

Save Rwanda and Africa

French Presidential candidate Jacques Cheminade issued the following statement on Nov. 27.

Judge Bruguière’s report on the events in Rwanda in 1994 confirm what we have consistently said, here in France and in the U.S.A.

Paul Kagame directly organized the attack against Rwandan President Juvénal Habyarimana’s airplane, creating the conditions for the Hutu genocide.

Subsequently, Paul Kagame (now President of Rwanda) organized the massacre of Hutu refugees in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

It is true that the Hutu genocide had been prepared well before 1994, especially through the Mille Collines radio programs, and that François Mitterrand’s government did next to nothing at the time to stop the disaster building up.

However, Ugandan President Yoweri Museveni and Paul Kagame themselves, with the help of Anglo-American intelligence agencies, counted on massacres of their own Tutsi people, as a pretext for taking power in Kigali.

The conclusion to be drawn from this horrendous situation is simple: The conditions for economic, social, and cultural development have to be recreated in Africa, to eliminate the bases on which religious wars and inter-ethnic massacres develop and spread.

After what we have done, or have failed to do, in Rwanda, we now have the duty, more than ever, to offer Africa a course of co-development and to defend it from looting, from whatever quarter.