

## Sudan resists U.N. plans for 'one-world' government

by Muriel Mirak Weissbach

The outcome of the current tug-of-war between the United Nations Security Council and the republic of Sudan could have far-reaching consequences, not only for Africa, but for the developing sector as a whole. Indeed, if Sudan comes out on top, this will be a decisive victory for the nation-state, as such, against the pretenses of one-world government.

The U.N. Security Council on Jan. 31 passed a resolution against Sudan, threatening it with sanctions, if three Egyptians suspected of having been involved in the assassination attempt against Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak last June, were not extradited. The U.N. resolution, presented by Egypt and Ethiopia on the instigation of the rotating chairman, Great Britain, took for granted that the three suspects were on Sudanese soil, and that the government in Khartoum knew their whereabouts, and was protecting them. None of the three allegations had been proven. But that did not seem to matter. The British had orchestrated a press campaign over months to establish the case against Sudan, and had bought Ethiopia and Eritrea, with a combination of debt forgiveness and new loans, through that other U.N. one-worldist entity, the International Monetary Fund.

The U.N. adjourned its January meeting with the agreement that they would meet again, after 60 days had passed, to hear a report by Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, on the Sudanese response.

### Baroness Cox's sideshow in Washington


In the meantime, the British unleashed their *Wunderwaffen*, Baroness Caroline Cox, member of the House of Lords, and international president of Christian Solidarity International (CSI), a British intelligence front which has led the crusade against Sudan. Baroness Cox opened up a second front in the propaganda war against Sudan, alleging that the

government is involved in slavery. Cox arranged for hearings to be held at the U.S. Congress on March 13, under the joint sponsorship of Reps. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R-Fla.) and Christopher Smith (R-N.J.), on "Slavery in Africa: Mauritania and Sudan," and arranged for herself to be invited as an expert witness (see *EIR*, April 5, "What's Wrong with U.S. Africa Policy?"). The purpose of the hearings was not to seek any immediate Congressional action, but to whip up a little more hysteria in the all-too-naive Congress and in "public opinion." As Cox's colleague at CSI, John Eibner, declared, "Slavery is an important issue, to motivate people." If the allegations of harboring terrorists were not sufficient, certainly the slavery issue would help. During the hearings, Cox called for trade, weapons, and oil sanctions against Sudan, while her sidekick Gaspar Biro, the Special Rapporteur of the U.N. for Human Rights Violations in Sudan, called for "permanent monitors" to be stationed in the country. A Sudanese exile, from something called Pax Sudani, called for partition outright.

Neither Cox nor her southern Sudanese cohorts expected any serious opposition to their travelling sideshow. However, the Schiller Institute, which had exposed the British intentions behind the Security Council January sessions at the time, intervened again, in Washington, to challenge Cox, with written testimony presented to the hearings.

### Diplomatic offensive by Khartoum

Simultaneously, the Sudanese government launched an ambitious diplomatic offensive, sending high-ranking members to meet with their counterparts in many countries of the non-aligned sector, countries which the British were planning to use as their front men, in the next round at the Security Council. Thus, in March, Sudanese Foreign Minister Ali Osman Taha, Chairman of the National Congress Dr. Ghazi



Author Muriel Mirak Weissbach leads a Schiller Institute rally in Washington against Baroness Caroline Cox's appearance at Congressional hearings on March 13.

Salhuddin Attabani, and President Gen. Omar Al-Bashir met with government officials from Indonesia, Malaysia, China, Iran, the United Arab Emirates, Syria, Nigeria, Kenya, Chile, and many other countries, briefing them on the truth of the matter, as opposed to the fictions spread by the British. The Sudanese also issued a White Paper, with the documented facts on what ensued, following the assassination attempt against Mubarak.

Most important, though not directly related to the fraudulent charges against Sudan, the country completed the process of elections, during the month of March (see *EIR*, April 5, "British Gnash Their Teeth, as Sudan Conducts First Democratic Elections"). The direct, popular elections for Parliament and the President, which were certified as free and fair by a delegation of monitors from the Organization of African Unity on March 20, established a new fact, whose implications implicitly undermined the campaign of slanders. Significantly, since the elections, even those press organs in Europe most eager to parrot the British line on Sudan, experienced some discomfort. The accusation of electoral fraud, to be expected from quarters that had characterized the elections beforehand as a "farce," was nowhere to be seen. Rather, papers like the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* and *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* contented themselves with presenting a hostile picture of the political forces elected to power.

### Fancy footwork at the United Nations

As a result of these processes, the game at the U.N. Security Council, though rigged, did not seem to proceed according to the fix. Even before the 60-day period had elapsed, Boutros-Ghali made some statements regarding his findings, during the Sharm el-Sheikh summit on terrorism in March. Significantly, Sudan was *not* the main target of attacks there, but Iran was.

Once the two-month period was over, it was expected that the Security Council would convene and ram through the sanctions as threatened. But this did not happen. The first week of April saw continuous meetings in New York, during which a resolution draft was circulating informally. According to a wire by the British press agency Reuters, which somehow came in possession of the draft, it was circulated by Egypt, Botswana, and Guinea-Bissau, "the council's three African members," and called for wide-ranging sanctions, among them a ban on "the supply to Sudan of arms and related equipment, technical advice, assistance or training." In addition, Sudan Airways "and all Sudanese-registered aircraft" would be barred from "taking off, landing, or flying over their territory" and the airline's offices abroad would not be allowed to operate. Furthermore, there would be reductions in number of staff of Sudanese diplomatic missions, restrictions and controls on the remaining staff, and on the travel of repre-

sentatives of the government or armed forces. Finally, “international and regional organizations would be called on not to hold any conferences in Sudan.”

Such sanctions, if implemented, would be used to paralyze the central government, while beefing up military operations of rebel forces in the south and Ethiopian forces from the east, to realize Baroness Cox’s strategy of “expanding the war to the north” and “overthrowing the Khartoum regime.”

Even during the “private” discussions at the U.N., however, resistance appeared. The Indonesian and Chilean delegations refused to even take part in the discussions, and the Indonesians made known that they would prefer a collective statement on Sudan to any formal resolution. The wires reported Chinese and Russian wariness about any kind of economic sanctions, such as an air embargo. The caucus of Arab States made known their unwillingness to vote for sanctions against Sudan. The resolution itself apparently no longer included an arms embargo. Furthermore, Egypt made clear that it would oppose economic sanctions, as they would boomerang, hurting that country more than its southern neighbor.

Resistance appeared as well inside Great Britain, as 20,000 signatures opposing sanctions, collected by various Muslim organizations in the U.K., were presented to members of Parliament and to the Foreign Office, which latter received a delegation of the Muslim Solidarity Committee of Great Britain. Protests of the Schiller Institute continued in the United States, especially in front of the U.N. in New York, and the missions of Egypt, Botswana, and Guinea-Bissau were besieged by telephone calls and faxes, demanding that they desist from demanding sanctions.

### **Consultations with Egypt**

As the private discussions were slated to continue through Easter, the news was leaked in Khartoum of important, new initiatives by the government. Sources said they expected breaking news of high-level meetings between Sudan and Egypt. Already during Easter week, there were clear signs of relaxation of tensions between Cairo and Khartoum. President Al-Bashir, upon inauguration, made a goodwill gesture announcing his intention to improve relations with all countries, especially the sister-nation, Egypt. Dr. Hassan Al-Turabi, elected to Parliament, and elected, by acclamation, to be its speaker, issued similar statements, inviting the Egyptians to sit down and settle the dispute rationally, and bilaterally.

The response from Mubarak was encouraging, as the Egyptian President indicated that he did not wish to see U.N. sanctions which would harm Sudan. A Foreign Ministry official from Cairo, Sayed Kassem el-Masri, was quoted saying that Egypt opposed any economic or military sanctions against Sudan, because it is concerned for Arab national security and the unity of Sudanese territory.” There were even reports of Saudi-Sudanese talks, which contributed to easing tensions regionally. Some area sources mooted that General Al-Bashir might expel certain undesirable elements from the

country, again as a goodwill gesture.

Important developments were unfolding on the political level inside Sudan, which could contribute to foiling the British plan for splitting the nation, through sanctions. As the new government was being put together before Easter, reports indicated that it would include several representatives of those southern tribes, mainly the Dinka of John Garang and the Nuer of Riak Machar, which had been engaged in war against Khartoum. Machar’s rebel forces had recently come to an agreement with the government, and now a majority of Garang’s own tribe was said to have left him in the lurch. An unconfirmed report appeared April 4, that Garang was in a hospital in Asmara, Eritrea, recovering from bullet wounds received during an attempt on his life.

### **What next?**

What will happen at the Security Council, when it convenes in official session, cannot be predicted. By April 3, the resistance inside the U.N. had yielded results: The draft resolution under discussion had been considerably watered down, and references to the air and arms embargoes had been dropped. Instead, the new draft, written by Egypt, called for 1) States to reduce the “number and level” of staff at Sudanese diplomatic missions; 2) States to restrict entry into or transit through their territory of Sudanese government officials or soldiers; and 3) international and regional organizations not to hold conferences in Sudan.

Responding to this resistance, U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. Madeleine Albright went on a rampage, shouting out over BBC airwaves, that she had proof of Sudanese involvement in terrorism. She raved that Sudan was “a viper’s nest of terrorists.”

What is certain, is that the members of the Non-Aligned Movement within the Security Council are no longer willing to accept the role of rubber stamp for the whims of the Permanent Five. One delegate, in fact, raised the issue of the legitimacy of the entire system, whereby the Permanent Five members exert de facto control over the entire body. No one has forgotten the brutality with which George Bush’s United States and the United Kingdom bribed and browbeat delegations in 1990, to force them to endorse what became a genocidal war against Iraq—and sanctions which continue to the present day. Those nations which refused the bribery—Sudan, Mauritania, Yemen, and Jordan—were treated to punishment none of them has forgotten.

The question placed before the members of the Security Council is straightforward: Do they want to provide a cosmetic “Third World” cover for an embargo against a developing nation, to serve the geopolitical aims of Britain, an imperial force gone mad? Or do they want to stand up and assert the rights which they, as sovereign nation-states, hold, according to international law? It seems to be dawning on many developing sector nations, that if they let this happen to Sudan today, their heads may be on the chopping block tomorrow.