

West Tries To Spark A New Sudan War

by Lawrence K. Freeman

Feb. 17—A mere seven months after the division of Sudan into two separate nations, words of war are in the air again, after all parties declared an “end to war” following the July 9, 2011 creation of the Republic of South Sudan. Who is responsible for this new round of brinkmanship between Sudan and South Sudan?

Throughout history we have repeatedly seen how nations are destroyed by allowing themselves to be enticed into wars, orchestrated by foreign powers. This is how the British-centered financial empire has survived for centuries. Such is the case today with the rising tensions between Sudan and South Sudan, being manipulated by the British and their ideological followers in the United States.

Sources report that U.S. operatives are advising South Sudan to, in effect, destroy their own country to serve London’s desire for war between Khartoum and Juba. Among those who are goading the leadership of South Sudan to shut down their oil wells in an attempt to punish Khartoum are: the anglophile Susan Rice, U.S. Ambassador to the UN; anti-Khartoum extremist John Prendergast; and Roger Winter, a former U.S. government representative known for his support for South Sudan against the “brutal cabal” in the North, and who is serving South Sudan badly with his ill counsel.

The division of Sudan has solved none of the underlying problems, but was it really meant to? The unresolved grievances between North and South were pushed aside, in order to set into motion the next “act” of this British-orchestrated tragedy, with the creation of an independent South Sudan. Through manipulation, prejudice, and the work of traitors to their country, South Sudan is being induced to undermine its own young, fragile existence for the dubious goal of overthrowing the government in Khartoum, and igniting yet another war in the Horn of Africa, this one potentially even more murderous than the previous ones.

Conflict over Oil

South Sudan’s crude oil production, which provides 98% of its revenues, has become the preferred

weapon of self-destruction. Sharing of the oil revenues after separation was one of several cancerous issues left unresolved, and, as anticipated, is now eating away at both countries.

South Sudan pumps out about 350,000 barrels of oil per day valued at close to \$8 billion, compared to Sudan's production of 110,000, a portion of which is for internal consumption. However, South Sudan has to pump its oil 1,600 kilometers across Sudan, to be loaded onto tankers at Port Sudan on the Red Sea for export. In a dispute over fees paid to Sudan by South Sudan for the shipment of the oil, a conflict brewing for months finally came to a head in January. Sudan seized several tankers of oil as payment for the use of its pipeline and port facilities. South Sudan retaliated by closing down its 900 oil wells. Pagan Amum, General Secretary of the ruling party of South Sudan, the Sudan People's Liberation Movement (SPLM), declared that he would rather have the oil stay in the ground than allow Sudan to be compensated.

The African Union's High Level Implementation Panel on Sudan, headed by Thabo Mbeki (former President of South Africa), met in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia in late January, with Presidents Omar al-Bashir of Sudan and Salva Kiir of South Sudan, to try to avoid a total shutdown of oil production. With pleas from Mbeki and Ethiopian Prime Minister Meles Zenawi, Bashir ordered the release of four tankers of oil. Reports are that Kiir was ready to agree to a compromise proposed by Mbeki, but after receiving a phone call, abruptly changed his mind, and rejected the AU proposal. No agreement was reached, and all the oil wells have ceased production.

Some suggest that the phone call to Kiir came from a representative of the United States. According to sources, both Winter and Prendergast, who have been backing South Sudan against Khartoum for decades, are now advising the SPLM that it would be best for South Sudan not to pay for the transport of their oil through Sudan, even if it means destroying its own economy. Susan Rice, who functions like a drone missile targeting Khartoum, was indoctrinated in British colonial policies towards Africa during her stint at Oxford University as a Rhodes scholar. There are also indications of increased U.S. military support to South Sudan, including establishing a new military base there for operations in East Africa and beyond.

Who Benefits?

Alex de Waal, a U.S. specialist on Sudan, who has been involved in the country since the 1980s, wrote in the *New York Times* on Jan. 24 titled "South Sudan's Doomsday Machine," that South Sudan will have to be compensated with \$650 million a month to make up for the loss of oil revenues. Will Washington foot the bill?

The government of South Sudan has signed a memorandum of understanding with Kenya to build a 2,000-km pipeline to a new port on the Kenyan coast for export of oil, but estimates are that this will take to 2-3 years to construct, and cost \$3-4 billion. The loss of billions of dollars in oil revenues, plus the cost for a new pipeline would severely impact the people of South Sudan, who live in the most underdeveloped nation on the planet, and are struggling just to survive. Tribes are ravaging each other's land and stealing each other's cattle, while the World Food Program says it will have to supply food to 2.7 million South Sudanese this year (total population: 8.3 million). Not immediately investing all possible resources in building up the economy would create conditions that could lead to rebellions against the government.

Another consequence of the oil shutdown is the effect on China. Sudan and South Sudan accounted for 5% of China's crude oil imports in 2011, its seventh-largest supplier. China, the largest investor in South Sudan, is now seeking new sources of oil to meet its needs. To restart the flow of oil, if and when production resumes, will take weeks, possibly months, and some speculate that this interim could provide the opportunity for China to be pushed out, or its position weakened, with Western oil companies moving into South Sudan's oil fields. This, while China is already a target of the Obama Administration and London for a new confrontation with the West.

Any true friend or concerned nation would encourage Khartoum and Juba to work together for the development of their two countries, to serve the interests of all the Sudanese people. Anyone who would oppose this is not to be trusted.

The U.S. actors, following a British script, who feign loyalty to South Sudan, but have another agenda, fit well the part of Iago in Shakespeare's *Othello*. Hopefully, responsible patriots in South Sudan will study Shakespeare's play, to avoid Othello's fate: committing their nation to suicide.

lkfreeman@prodigy.net