

# U.S.-Sudan Relations: Development or Military Intervention?

by Lawrence K. Freeman

Sept. 16—Mahdi Ibrahim Mohamed (interviewed below) was the last ambassador from Sudan to the United States, having been recalled in 1998 following the U.S. bombing of a harmless pharmaceutical plant north of Khartoum. A year earlier, the U.S. decided not to replace its departing ambassador to Sudan. Thus, for over a dozen years, diplomatic relations between the two countries have suffered.

In 1998, there was one Sudan; now Sudan has been divided in two. Then, it was Susan Rice, as Assistant Secretary of State for Africa, who, with her cohorts, led the campaign for regime change against Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir. Today it is the same Susan Rice, now President Barack Obama's ambassador to the United Nations, who has continued the campaign to overthrow the government of Sudan. The new twist is, that today, the drums for NATO intervention against Sudan are being beat under the cover of the new doctrine called Responsibility to Protect or R2P, which allows Western military forces to violate national sovereignty, solely by their military authority. Citing the "success" of NATO deployments under the rubric of R2P, in two African countries this year, anti-Khartoum extremists are now calling for the establishment of a no-fly zone, and/or bombing of selective military targets in Sudan.

Britain's former Prime Minister Tony Blair first publicly advocated R2P in a speech in the United States in 1999, as a globalist doctrine of preemptive intervention, in an explicit effort to eradicate the 1648 Westphalian principle of the nation-state. Drug-legalizer George Soros, who serves the City of London's financial empire, has campaigned for R2P to become the international law of the UN, and championed the creation of the International Criminal Court (ICC) for the same purpose.

## Development Is the Alternative

In his interview, Ambassador Ibrahim mentions his constructive discussion with Johnnie Carson, the cur-

rent Assistant Secretary of State. While it is important to have open diplomatic channels between the United States and Sudan, much, much, more is needed.

Both Sudan and the new republic of South Sudan have been severely injured, albeit in different ways, from the division of the country on July 9, 2011. The wrenching separation has led to continued armed conflicts, in both the North and the South, which should not have been astonishing to any observer who knows Sudan. In fact, one can even suspect that these conflicts along the newly drawn border were anticipated, as an excuse to stymie any improved U.S.-Sudanese relations.

U.S. economic sanctions have been destructive, and did nothing but weaken both North and South Sudan. All sanctions should be lifted immediately; there is absolutely no justification for any further delay, except if one desires to see the Sudanese people suffer more hardship.

The decades of refusal by the West to actually assist the people of Sudan by building necessary infrastructure in water, power, and rail transportation, as part of a regional approach to increase food production, have left Sudan, especially South Sudan, vastly underdeveloped. With the effects of the collapse of the global monetarist system being felt in both Khartoum and Juba, and the growing worldwide food shortage, the economies of both Sudans will further decline unless the global system is changed. Since the trans-Atlantic nations are disintegrating by the hour, little, if any significant help from the U.S. and the West can be expected under these conditions.

The spirit of cooperation that led to the peaceful division of Sudan, referred to by Ambassador Ibrahim, must become substantive. But without the U.S. breaking from the British monetarist policy that is responsible for the genocide in Africa, and Khartoum giving up any illusions about adapting to free-trade-dictated austerity economics, there will be no real progress. Recognizing that the self-interest of each nation lies in the development of the other, a new joint mission in the self-interest of both Sudan and South Sudan must be adopted. If their combined untapped agriculture and water potential were developed to produce food at a rate that can feed all the Sudanese people and export surpluses to the nations of the Horn and the Maghreb, then at least a pathway to peace will have been established.

Support for such an effort is the only sane policy for the United States to pursue.