

# Britain and France Lead The Attack Against Sudan

by Douglas DeGroot

April 30—President Barack Obama’s Special Envoy to Sudan, Air Force Maj. Gen. Scott Gration (ret.) and Sen. John Kerry (D-Mass), chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, have signaled a change in approach of U.S. policy toward Sudan, away from confrontation, and toward bilateral diplomatic engagement. After meeting officials at the Sudanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs on April 2, Gration said: “The United States and Sudan want to be partners, and so we are looking for opportunities for us to build a stronger bilateral relationship.”

Later, after a three-day trip to Sudan, Kerry said on National Public Radio’s “All Things Considered” program on April 20: “I found a government that is far more prepared to move on other issues that are of importance to the United States, and I think it’s important for us to deal with those officials. And we’ll have to work around and deal with the complications of the ICC.” (The International Criminal Court is the privately established body, of which the United States is not a member, which issued an “arrest warrant” in 2008 for Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir.)

Given this shift, the head of the United Nations-African Union Mission in Darfur (UNAMID), Rodolphe Adada, was apparently surprised when he was criticized by U.S. Ambassador Susan Rice at a closed session of the UN Security Council on April 27, according to the *Sudan Tribune*. Adada, a former foreign minister

of the Democratic Republic of Congo, told the UNSC, “Darfur today is a conflict of all against all. The armed movements fight amongst each other, or violently purge their own members.”

He countered the anti-Sudan media hype, saying that the situation in Darfur has now become a low-intensity conflict, and provided figures of 2,000 people who died from violence there since January 2008. Adada said that the ICC arrest warrant has complicated prospects for a political solution.

Rice, a dyed-in-the-wool anglophile, questioned his use of the phrase “low-intensity conflict.” She claimed he was not in agreement with his superior, UN Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon. However, it is clear that Adada and the Secretary General are collaborating closely on operations in the region. Prior to Adada’s meeting with the UNSC, a UNAMID spokesperson said that Adada intended to review issues affecting the deployment of UNAMID, which “required key enablers to enhance the capacity of the Mission and enable it to carry out its mandate more effectively.” This refers specifically to helicopters, which are desperately needed by UNAMID, and is the precise terminology which has been used by Ban Ki-Moon.

## Colonial Powers Push Regime Change

Despite the U.S. shift, the two primary former colonial powers in Africa, the U.K. and France, have re-

mained steadfast in their policy of regime change. On April 21, a high-level Sudanese delegation ended talks in Paris with French officials and Britain's Lord Mark Malloch-Brown, a Foreign Office Secretary, and a key figure in the founding of the ICC. The two ex-colonial powers refused to establish bilateral relations with Sudan, and "reiterated their commitment to international criminal justice and cooperation with the ICC," according to the *Sudan Tribune*. One of the Sudanese participants in the talks, Presidential Assistant Nafi Ali Nafi, called the ICC "a political tool used against African leaders who are viewed to be uncooperative with Western programs in Africa." While speaking at Khartoum University on April 28, Nafi revealed that the proposal put forward to Sudan at the Paris meeting, was for the formation of "a national interim government" headed by

al-Bashir. France would support suspending the ICC arrest warrant against him, if he withdrew as a candidate in the 2010 elections. U.S. anti-Sudan activist John Prendergast had offered Sudan the same deal earlier.

Nafi charged that those who are collaborating with foreign powers to accomplish regime change in Sudan were committing treason. He pointed out that the Darfur rebel group, Justice and Equality Movement (JEM), was not founded to better the lot of the Darfur population, but was merely an arm of the Popular Congress Party led by Hassan al-Turabi, in the latter's fight with the government. Turabi is a long-time member of the British-intelligence-connected Muslim Brotherhood. The JEM's mostly London-based leadership refuses to negotiate agreements with the government on Darfur issues.

---

Dr. Mutrif Siddiq

---

## We Fight for a Better Life For Our Entire Population



*Sudan's Undersecretary for Foreign Affairs, Dr. Mutrif Siddiq, gave this briefing at the Foreign Ministry on April 6, to the foreign delegates, including several EIR correspondents, who were attending a conference in Khartoum (see EIR, April 24, 2009).*

Sudan is at a crossroads: Certain forces, through new means, are working to re-exert colonialism. To counteract that, we need a new approach. There are very sincere entities, there are very sincere persons, there are very sincere organizations, who share with us these ideas, who are working hard towards a just, international system. Unfortunately, we don't feel at all that the existing world order is a just one, including the United Nations itself. And the United Nations is represented as a supreme political body, that is, the Security Council, which was formed after the Second World War, and it was accepted and agreed to, based on certain attitudes prevailing at that time.

In light of developments concerning Sudan, reforms in the Security Council must be considered. And we think one of the unjust rules is that certain countries have special rights, where they are protected, and they can protect those whom they like, those whom they love, and the others are targeted for subjugation and intimidation and harassment, like the case of Sudan.

For example, in the year 2004, and the year 2005, most of the resolutions of the Security Council were directed towards the case of Sudan, and the case in Darfur.

This doesn't come out of the blue. This doesn't reflect the concern of the international community for the innocent people of Darfur who have been affected by civil wars. Because even the civil war in Sudan is not caused by the simple reasons that have been circulated in the media—that there is a fight between Arab and non-Arab tribes in Darfur—this is just a fallacy.

## Problems in Darfur Are Not New

We think that the problems in Darfur are more complicated than that. We are afraid of the desertification that has affected the whole continent, and Sudan is severely affected. The biggest wave of displacement, the biggest wave of challenges that we have faced, was not in the years 2003 and 2004. It goes back in history. The most recent one, was the displacement and the resultant flow of refugees that took place in 1984, when we in Sudan received millions of refugees from the East and West. At that time, Ethiopia was united. We had received more than a million refugees from the eastern front; and we had received more than a million refugees from the neighbors in Chad. They had been forced into Sudan because of the drought that affected the wells in that year.

Despite the displacement, at that time, Sudan managed to absorb the serious shock, and to receive all these waves of refugees and IDPs [internally displaced persons], and feed them, alone first, and then with the help of the international community, at that time. And we do remember that President Bush, the father—at that time he was the Vice President of the United States—came to Sudan and he visited Kordofan and Darfur, and the United States offered some help to the Sudanese government to address the needs of the masses of refugees that came into Sudan from neighboring countries.

We are quite happy for that. We don't deny the favors; we recognize them, and thank those that helped us. But, any conditional assistance, or conditional help, which conceals agendas within that help, is not acceptable for us in Sudan. Because if you want to assist someone, you have to assist him in good faith. You have to assist to rectify that situation, and to get back to a normal situation. But if you utilize the problems to undermine the whole system, and to change the whole world, and use it as a means of manipulation, it is not going to help.

In Darfur, we have two major life styles: We have the nomads and the farmers. They always compete for their resources, and these resources are affected by the threat of desertification, and we have the advancement of the desert in Sudan. Every year it is said that the desert is advancing by more than 100 kilometers in Sudan. This is a shared responsibility. If we don't reverse the situation, it is now Sudan; but tomorrow it is going to be Niger, or Mali, or Algeria, or Senegal, or whatever. Or it might even go somewhere else.

The situation in Sudan is not even compared to the D.R.C. [Democratic Republic of Congo], where the D.R.C. problem is the typical regional and international conflict, because all the countries around the D.R.C. are involved. Some of the major powers are competing over the resources of the D.R.C.. What is the magnitude of displacement? What is the magnitude of killing? What is the magnitude of insecurity in the D.R.C.? But this is not mentioned.

Our internal conflict has been blown up and described as a threat to international security. This is why the series of resolutions—up to ten within less than two years in the UN Security Council—is a manifestation of the monopoly of the institution which shares the objectives of certain circles. That's why the Darfur problem was blown up as a humanitarian crisis, although it was an internal conflict that has flared up repeatedly. We had a conflict in 1986, but, at that time, the Cold War was still there, and no one was talking about internal conflicts. It passed, unnoticed, and the internal dynamics managed to absorb that conflict.

## Rebels Are Run from London, Paris

The same could have been applied to the conflict in 2003, but because of the international dimensions, because of the regional hands that entered into the conflict in Darfur, these outside factors made the conflict something other than the internal conflict it actually was. The supposed internal conflict, as it is presented in the media, is not coherent with the actions of the rebel movements. Each anti-government movement wanted to appear as a separate entity, because it was supported by certain outside interests, and was so accepted in the media.

Where are the major rebel groups now? The U.K. is actually hosting the major leaders, with the exception of Khalil Ibrahim, of the JEM, that is the Justice and Equality Movement. Jibril Ibrahim, a brother of Khalil, is there in the U.K. Ahmed Tugod Lissan, chief negotiator at the Abuja talks, is there. The spokesman for JEM, Ahmed Hussein Adam, is there. And many others.

They are sponsored by the U.K. But what is the role of the U.K. in establishing this in Sudan? They reveal it themselves. They instruct us to make peace, but how can I make peace when they are holding the cards? When you are not encouraging those who are leading the rebellion to go and talk. The same applies to France, which is hosting Abdel Wahid Nur. If they want to tell



EIRNS/Douglas DeGroot

*The AU-UN force in Darfur has not been able to receive desperately needed helicopters for transportation to trouble spots. Here, a UN helicopter at the El Fasher airport in North Darfur.*

him to go and talk peace, he will definitely go and talk peace. But they say, “We are very democratic, we cannot force him to do so.”

Peace is not a choice, it is not optional. Our people are suffering inside Sudan, while he is sitting in Paris, and refuses to join the talks in Doha, or the talks elsewhere. This is their responsibility. But instead, they are working against the interests of Sudan. Although Sudan has made many attempts: We have declared a ceasefire, unilaterally, many times, with no results. This was repeated many times, and when we at last went to Doha, one of the major ideas that was put to us by the chief negotiator, was to conclude an agreement on two issues: One of them is to have a treaty, which we have accepted, and the other was a preliminary agreement that organizes a plan for successfully implementing peace in Sudan. We have accepted both, but the rebels have declined.

We did the same when we were invited in October 2007 to Sirte, Libya. We went there, with open mind and heart, we declared a unilateral ceasefire. But still, their chief claim was that the government of Sudan was the party that was reluctant to achieve peace, while they participated in the talks. What about Khalil Ibrahim, himself, and his forces? They attempted to broaden their role, were rebuffed, and went back to Chad. They attempted again to come to Nigeria, were rebuffed, and they are now in Chad. They are now deploying forces in Geneina, which is the capital of West Darfur, waiting for two things to happen.

The first one is American policy toward Sudan. It is up to you to restore the peace. The rebels are not

sure what the real American policy toward Sudan is. Either they will be granted permission to advance their hostilities, undermine security, and destabilize the city, or else they will be exposed for what they are. So you, our brothers, you have a role to play, here and there.

Second, they are waiting for the ICC [International Criminal Court]! And once the ICC had declared its decision, of the warrant of arrest of the President of the Republic, Khalil declared that he was not going to join peace efforts again. His path has shifted. He is going to continue fighting. He is going to be the arm of the ICC, to overthrow the government, arrest the President, and take him to The Hague.

Is that the intention of international justice? I think this is not the intention of international justice. But this is the intention of those who are behind using international justice as a tool of harassment, as a form of intimidation, against the regimes which they don't feel that they are on good terms with. They had been expecting that Sudan would collapse, that the Sudanese people would revolt against the leadership. That there would be rebel moves or advances toward the towns, and this was expected to be the end of the story. They were shocked [when this didn't happen].

### **The Threat Posed by the ICC Charges**

And we were shocked too. Although we had received hints, to be frank, prior to the formation of the ICC justice caper, what the decision of the court was going to be: that they were going to drop the crime of genocide, and were going to go with the other two crimes:



crimes against humanity and war crimes. I swear, this is what we knew prior to the announcement of the ICC arrest warrant. And unfortunately, and shockingly, this is what the decision of the ICC was. And they thought that we would accept this independent court as a legal court.

[ICC prosecutor Luis Moreno] Ocampo went to Yale University and was spreading lies about Sudan. And he was actually playing on people's emotions, using the supposed plight of the children of Sudan, and also claiming that about 5,000 people were dying per month in Darfur, without even cross-checking. This is the so-called evidence that is being used by the enemy. It is part of a conspiracy to prevent the rebels from coming to the table of peace, and to induce them, instead, to wait for the international community to agree to use "humanitarian" justifications to indict Sudan.

They want to use the right of military intervention, maybe through Chad, or by air, and so on. And we are always hearing about the extreme course of aid embargos and more sanctions to strangle the government of Sudan, and so on. But believe me, if we listen to those threats, and allow ourselves to be frightened by that course, we will never move a step forward. We have been facing this situation for almost the last 30 years. This is not new for us.

On the other hand, U.S. policy against Sudan has often been based on the idea of containment, the use of neighboring countries to undermine the system in Sudan, and to support their anti-Sudan goals. At that time, the United States said that it supported these neighboring countries with non-military supplies. But, in time of war, lethal and non-lethal forms of aid are equally important. Because if you give someone food, or you support him medically, at the time of fighting, this makes it easier for him to aid the anti-Sudan military effort. They can aid someone's medical corps. It is not fighting. But it is facilitating the welfare of the fighting groups of that country.

So I think our mission is to understand the plan, the scenarios, and to apply counter-scenarios, to defeat them. I think we are not alone in the world. First of all, we believe in God. God is great. Definitely.

The United States is not the only superpower. We are looking for the super-, super-, super-superpower. Once we have that conviction, the United States will be cut down to size. Once we are having noble objectives, while not deviating from those objectives—because for us killing is prevented by religion; rape is prevented by

religion; robbery is prevented by religion. All these types of activities which have been called tactics used by Sudan, are not in our nature. These are not our practice. This is why we feel harmed by these false allegations which the media has thrown against us, because it is contrary to our humanity, is contrary to our belief. It is contrary to our practice and conduct. So this is the biggest blow against us.

Why, in fighting a rebellion in my country, would I be labeled as exercising genocide? While these same forces are ostensibly exercising their right to defend their security, fighting from countries which are thousands of miles away, they are attacking those who are exercising their rights to protect their own people inside their country. What do you call it other than the worst hypocrisy?

This is why, our brothers, we think that this is our time to think in a new manner. We are happy with the call of President Obama for change. But we don't think that this task is an easy one, because there are many hawks who will not allow him to go onto that path, because it is contrary to the interest of many of them.

But let us have hope. This is why we have extended our hand to the new envoy of President Obama, who is still here with us in Sudan. We have been quite transparent, quite receptive, hoping that he will come with an open mind and an open heart, to work with us during the situation. We are true believers, and truth lovers. We want to live in peace with the whole world, including America, and the U.K., and France. And we never will stop our dialogue and our engagement, unless we are forced to do so. Because we think that we are equipped with the knowledge, we are equipped with the right thing, that will convince those who are sincere, those who are credible, those who are fair and neutral, to work hand in hand with us. So we really call for that sort of cooperation, that sort of engagement, that sort of understanding that will let us all live in peace.

## **Peace Through Developing the Entire Nation**

So accept our apology for this lengthy talk, but believe me, no one can doubt our intention for treating our people in a different manner, to allow them to share power with us. The National Electoral Commission has declared a timetable for elections in Sudan. This is a very fundamental decision, that is going to broaden the base for peace, that is going to send a message to all. We have an opportunity to broaden the base of the govern-

ment. And anyone who has the ambition to govern this country through rule, and an agreed-upon program, will gain the support of the majority of the people, to have power, to have the opportunity, instead of taking up arms, to have a better life, an easier one. So we are after that change.

And we think that if we weaken any part of Sudan, if you continue this process of strengthening one part of the country against the other part of the country, or support this party against that one, the outcome is not going to be fair. It is not going to be acceptable. It will not create a lasting peace in Sudan. So we hope that we will all be here in a fair manner that will respect the choices of the Sudanese people themselves.

---

## Interview: Osman Yosuf Kibr

---

# The Western Media Is Lying About Darfur

*Osman Yosuf Kibr, the Wali (Governor) of the State of Northern Darfur, Sudan, was interviewed by LaRouche Youth Movement leader Summer Shields, in the state capital Al-Fashir, on April 7, 2009. Shields was visiting Sudan as part of a four-person LaRouche delegation, April 4-10 (see EIR, April 24). The Wali's remarks were translated from Arabic.*

**EIR:** What are the conditions like inside the IDP [internally displaced persons] camps?

**Wali Kibr:** The conditions are stable in the refugee camps, and the proof is that, one, there are no epidemics in the camps; and two, that the rate of mortality is declining, and that there is a steady improvement in the living conditions and a continuous decline in the rate of malnutrition. The level of nutrition in the camps is actually better than that in the cities. The humanitarian and security situation is stable.

**EIR:** There are accusations that the government of Sudan is committing atrocities, that there is a conflict between Arabs and blacks, and there are hundreds of thousands dead. What would you say?

**Wali Kibr:** This is absolutely not true. What we know about Darfur is that there are no whites or blacks at all. In Darfur all the people are a mixture, a cross-breeding of Arabs and Africans across the ages. And therefore, there is no pure African and there is no pure Arab here. Everyone here in Darfur is a Darfuri. Therefore, such a claim is unfounded.

**EIR:** Has there been an increase in the rate of deaths since the NGOs were kicked out of Darfur?

**Wali Kibr:** There has been no impact of these organizations. These organizations are intermediaries and not donor organizations. Their assignments were limited to conveying the aid. Some of them worked in marginal efforts, others in water, sanitation, and environmental improvement works. The truth is that the relevant ministries [of the government of Sudan], the national, and the other international organizations totally filled the gap that was left by the departure of these organizations. And thank God, the conditions are stable right now.

**EIR:** What message would you send to the people of the United States?

**Wali Kibr:** What I would like to convey to the people of the United States, is that the people of Sudan are not enemies of the people of the United States, and the people of Darfur are friends of the people of the United States. The issue of Darfur has to be seen with both eyes and listened to with both ears. There is a great deal of disinformation and distortion on the issue of Darfur. The issue is now limited to foreign interventions, personal and egotistic ambitions, and a distorting mass media.

We call on anybody who is physically capable to come over here to Darfur and witness for himself the reality. We assure you that the humanitarian and social conditions in Darfur are improving, and are not as bad as being transmitted through the media. That picture is very misleading. This does not mean that there is no problem in Darfur. There is a problem in Darfur. But it is not as dark as it is being portrayed to be.

The other issue is, that there is a great number of organizations that raise big sums of money from the American people, but none of that money is coming to Darfur. This money is never sent to Darfur, and the whole thing is becoming a business to get money from the donors to be spent somewhere else. And, I take full responsibility for what I am saying to you.