

EIR Feature

Sudan is next target for assault by 'new world order'

by Joseph Brewda

The U.S. State Department's announcement on Aug. 18 that it has put the Republic of Sudan on its list of terror-sponsoring nations, signals that Sudan has now become a top target for the Anglo-American advocates of a "new world order," much as Iraq had been prior to the Persian Gulf war. But the coming military and related actions against Sudan by the United States and the United Nations will not be confined to Sudan, but will trigger a widening destabilization of the entire region. Somalia, Kenya, Egypt, and Algeria are some of the nations that will be the most affected.

That Sudan would eventually be put on the list has been long expected, especially since December 1992, when then-Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger ordered a review of Sudan's ties to terrorism. Sudan was one of the small group of nations that refused to back the Anglo-American war on Iraq. Since that time, Sudan has been increasingly targeted in the U.S. and British media, and by the myriad of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that make it their business to destabilize sovereign nations.

With the potential capacity to feed all of Africa, and a tendency to develop that capacity, Sudan has been placed on the growing list of sovereign nations targeted for some sort of U.N. trusteeship. Anglo-American imperial policy considers food self-sufficiency on the part of a non-white nation, and especially a food-exporting capacity, to be as much of a *casus belli* as the impressive industrial capacity that Iraq had developed. Moreover, Sudan has had stormy relations with the International Monetary Fund; Sudan's suspension from voting rights by the IMF on Aug. 12, based on Sudan's balking at various of the Fund's austerity demands, is unprecedented.

That the claims made against Sudan are at least unsubstantiated, and often absurd, is evident from the State Department's own pronouncements. "The cumulative weight of the evidence establishes that Sudan is providing repeated support for international terrorism," State Department spokesman Mike McCurry stated

Sudan's land area compared to the continental United States



Harvesting jute in Sudan. A nation rich in agricultural potential and raw materials, it could be the breadbasket for the entire continent. As the map shows, it is a vast country; such a potential powerhouse is not at all to the liking of the oligarchical advocates of a "new world order."



in the press conference announcing the decision. But McCurry could not explain why the United States did not place Sudan on the list in April, when the annual list (which also includes Iran, Iraq, Libya, Cuba, and North Korea) was released. Nor could he cite what new evidence had been gathered since April justifying the decision. Sudan denied the accusation, and Foreign Ministry spokesman Gutbi Mehdi said, "We have challenged the Americans to come up with any proof that Sudanese territories are being used for terrorist acts."

British Empire on the move

From the standpoint of Anglo-American policymakers, another reason for the drive against Sudan is to increase the number of formerly sovereign states rendered into de facto British colonies. On Aug. 16, two days before the State Department announcement, Baroness Caroline Cox, the deputy speaker of the British House of Lords, demanded stepped up actions against Sudan. "The United Nations will be sending the right signals to the Khartoum government if it moves rapidly to impose an embargo on the shipment of weapons and oil to Sudan and to establish a military air exclusion zone over the south," she wrote in the *International Herald Tribune*. Cox, who specializes in destabilizing regions under "humanitarian" cover, also called for establishing "safe havens" in southern Sudan outside of government control for allegedly oppressed minorities. On Aug. 20, Tony Worthington, spokesman for the opposition Labour Party, and Conser-

vative MP Robert Banks held a press conference demanding that "Britain should take the lead at the U.N. Security Council and demand an immediate cease-fire" in the externally manipulated Sudanese civil war that government forces are now winning. The rebels are run by Britain, with the aid of Israel and Saudi Arabia.

The additional reasons for the Clinton administration decision are straightforward. The Clinton administration, it seems, will do almost anything to avoid stopping Serbia's murder of Bosnia, since that would demand confronting Serbia's primary sponsors: Britain and France. The thinking seems to be that a move against Sudan would deflect world attention from U.S. impotence. The British have naturally encouraged such delusions. On June 18, the Archbishop of Canterbury stated that "the time has come for world attention to be turned from Bosnia-Herzegovina to southern Sudan."

But while the United States condemned Sudan, it has also continued to carry out actions, together with Britain and Israel, to destabilize the Egyptian government of President Hosni Mubarak, a government supposedly at the mercy of "Sudanese-run fundamentalists." The Anglo-Americans are forcing Egypt to carry out IMF measures which are destroying its economy and radicalizing its population. At the same time, U.S. and British officials have stepped up their public and secret contacts with and patronage of the Islamic opposition within Egypt. An overthrow of the Egyptian government, using the same methods used to overthrow the Shah of Iran in 1979, is a top Anglo-American objective.