

General Omar al-Bashir of Sudan: Western Political Mythology in the Service of Big Oil

Matthew Raphael Johnson
Johnstown, PA

There are two general forms of government, monarchy and republican democracy. Even more broadly, these are traditionalism and modernism or liberalism. These are very general forms. The monarchy radiates authority (though not necessarily power) from the center and acts as a locus of unity for the polity, whether a city, nation or empire. He forces elites to support the common good and only then, to pursue their own. Here, law is natural and is discovered, rather than made. The republic is where elites or the regions serve their own good, and then meet in a central location to pass laws justifying this. They serve their own interests exclusively and often deny the very existence of a common good.

The monarchy, which includes military leaders, civilian authoritarians and traditional crowned heads, is very male. Its symbolized by the sun, the number One, Three, Seven and often, Nine. It is the land based power and sees commerce as a necessary evil, not a positive good in itself. The republic, or liberalism in general, is female, centered on the moon and is typified by the numbers Two, Five and Six. Its normally a sea based power and is dedicated to commerce. Often, the trickster gods are its patrons, while, for the monarchy, it is a figure such as Yahweh or a chief ruler such as Zeus. General Bashir, the subject of this paper, is a classic monarch, along with such rulers as Gen. Francisco Franco, the Cossack Hetmans or Tsar Nicholas.

African states, except Ethiopia, are artificial, the creation of western colonial empires. They all contain numerous nations within them. The Organization of African Unity, upon the mass achievement of independence in the 1960s, stated that keeping the older borders would be better than trying to devolve power according to tribal lines. They warned, with some justification, that the bloodshed would be far worse than keeping the colonial borders. None of them are nations in any sense of the term. They don't even count as "civil" nations.

Still, even before the "scramble for Africa" in the 1880s, Africa had been a patchwork of empires imposed by states that were themselves imperial entities. The most significant were the Kingdom of Aksum, the Mali Empire, the Dervish state, the Asante Union, the Oyo Empire, the Lunda Empire, the Wassoulou Empire, the Songhai Empire, the Maravi Empire, the Benin Empire and the state of Kanem-Bornu, among many others. All of these were primitive, slave-holding empires that received their technology and state forms from Islamic governments elsewhere. Often, western colonial governments took over once an empire began to shake through pressure from external enemies. The point is that all of these and many others were imperial regimes that cared little for ethnic circumstances. Africa would be in the same boat today even if a European never stepped foot on the continent.

In the hilarious (2012) comedy *The Dictator*, Sasha Baron-Cohen plays an autocratic ruler of a fictional North African, oil-rich country Waidya, loosely based on Qaddafi's Libya. His character, Admiral-General Aladeen, is meant to sign a democratic constitution drawn up by the US and the UN while in New York. His country has been threatened with "military action" unless he comes to the US and agrees to alter his policies and political system. He's captured by men hired by the local opposition, but he escapes. He's forced to get a job in an anarchist "green"

store called the “Free Earth Collective.” Using his skills as a dictator, he takes it over and crushes the competition.

Later, he's finally admitted to the UN and, as he tears the constitution up in disgust, he states, “this Constitution is nothing but a license for oil companies and foreign interests to destroy my beloved Waidya.” This is doubtless true. Then he says, in the final speech in New York:

Why are you so anti-dictatorship? Imagine if the US was a dictatorship. You could let one percent of the people control all the nation's wealth. You can help your rich friends get richer by cutting their taxes and bailing them out when they gamble and lose. You can ignore the needs of the poor for health care and education. Your media would appear free but be secretly controlled by one person and his family. You could wiretap phones. You can torture foreign prisoners. You could have rigged elections. You can lie about why you go to war. You can fill your prisons with one particular racial group and no one complains. You can use the media to scare the people into supporting policies that are against their interests. I know this is hard for you Americans to imagine, but please try. . . . Democracy is the worst. Its endless talking and listening to every stupid opinion. Everyone gets a vote no matter how crippled or black or female they are.

Only in a lighthearted comedy can a truth like this be uttered. The traditional court jester is the only man permitted to speak the truth because no one takes him seriously to begin with. Aladeen takes this all back because the woman he loves is seen crying in the audience and this lustful connection forces him to change his mind. It's the Sexual Revolution, in other words, that breaks down the discipline of autocracy. It is an attractive woman, in other words, that brings the dictator to change his mind.

He says to her at the signing of the new “Constitution,” as she walks in, “Democracy kisses you because she wants to, not because her father is in the next room, chained to a radiator with electrodes attached to his nipples. . . Democracy, I love you.” Only in the final scene in the movie is she revealed to be Jewish. Of course, a year later, the dictator wins the election with 98 percent of the vote and no one seems to mind, including his Jewish wife. He then takes the title, President-Prime Minister-Admiral-General Aladeen. She then opens “300 women's centers.” Autocracy would be needed to force that on the population.

Back in 2009, the NATO-backed “International Criminal Court” (ICC), tried to arrest another “dictator,” Omar Hassan Ahmad al-Bashir (born 1944) for “war crimes” in Sudan. They soon withdrew this for “lack of evidence.” In 2010, they tried again, this time claiming he was an “indirect participant,” not directly responsible, for the “crimes” in southern Sudan. Even his enemies cannot find evidence against him. The court's indictment has been opposed by the African Union, the League of Arab States and the Non-Aligned Movement.

Bashir is a Sudanese military officer, the seventh President of Sudan serving 30 years from 1989 to April of 2019, when he was overthrown. He is a legitimately promoted Army General and has earned his stars in combat, unlike the American officer corps and the western female “generals.”

The UN rejects all attempts to label him as a “terrorist,” though they don't seem to like him overall. Russia and China too are opposed, two countries that have invested in his society. This is the true cause of the west's hatred of him. He brought Sudan's oil wealth into the

Shanghai Cooperation Organization's orbit.

He overthrew the failed government of Sadiq al-Madhi who wanted to end the war with the southern part of the country. Madhi helped destroy the economy and devalued the Sudanese currency to only 10 percent of its 1979 value.

Bashir's reign has been highly productive, achieving high rates of economic growth even in the face of western-backed rebels in the south, sanctions and civil war. In fact, in the 30 year rule of Bashir, the average GDP growth rate was eight percent according to the IMF. He brought inflation to manageable levels. When he took over, inflation was about 50 percent. It rose immediately after his coup, but drastically fell to about two percent by 1998. The west supported and created the rebels in southern Sudan because they had promised to hand over oil fields to the highest bidder, which would have been the US or UK. Hence the massive propaganda war against Bashir over the last decade over southern Sudan, an obscure part of the world the media can say anything about and be believed.

There is another aspect of Johnson's Law, or Johnson's Law II. This states that when the press or semi-official agencies like Amnesty are excessively giving an obscure part of the world attention, then most of what's being said is false. There's also likely, if not always, an economic element to it. It's too different from Johnson's Law I to be a corollary to it, but both have to do with obscurity. Few people could point to South Sudan on a map, so why did so many multimillion dollar agencies obsess about it for so long? Clearly, it's not obscure to them. Why? In this case, it's about oil and China Petrochemical Corporation's interest in the area.

China began moving into Sudan and sponsoring some oil extractions. At the same time, Russia considered building a naval base. This explains April's coup and suggests that the CIA was behind it. Sudan was a large and potentially rich country, even without its southern part. It's one of the largest countries in Africa. One of the many proofs that Bashir wasn't a "tyrant" is that Sadiq al-Madhi, the man Bashir overthrew, soon came back to live in Sudan and freely organized opposite parties. He even ran for president. He was trained and educated in the west, and it was western interests he supported. The civil war raged under his rule and was inherited in 1989 by Bashir.

His government is a federal one with only limited powers granted to the central state. Therefore, in no way is Sudan a dictatorship in the traditional sense. It is a highly decentralized state and the president under this arrangement cannot necessarily be held responsible for the actions of governors elsewhere. However, in a civil war against all odds, harsh measures are not only necessary, but, given Sudan's history, the only measures that will earn him respect from his enemies as well as his supporters.

The two main "rebel groups" in the south are the Sudanese Liberation Army (SLA) and the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM). The JEM seems a suspicious name since it's such a western turn of phrase. It might as well be called the "Diversity and Inclusion Movement." It sounds like it was named by a group of university professors in the Ivy League. These are anything but popular groups. Richard Kurdt writes on them:

Beginning in early 2003, these two groups attacked and destroyed 80 or so police stations, killing upwards of 700 policemen. They attacked government garrisons and killed civilians. They have also attacked a number of different key developmental, educational and infrastructural projects, and have murdered a number of engineers working on those same projects. They attacked even a school

examination center, stealing the national examination papers and affecting the lives of tens of thousands of school students. Later in the conflict they can be seen attacking oil development projects and kidnapping and even killing Chinese citizens working on those projects, demanding that the Chinese oil companies be replaced by “Western” companies. *The “rebels” can be found again and again expressing hostility toward China, accusing them of supporting the genocidal Sudanese government* (Emphasis mine).

Yes, these “rebel” groups have stated as one of their demands that western oil companies replace the Chinese. If this doesn't prove CIA sponsorship, then nothing could. Destroying government clean water stations suggests foreign backing and direction, since a real group of this kind wouldn't be so stupid. Certainly, its only because they have foreign backing and, in fact, are the creation of foreign states that they'd commit such acts. Real groups like this, the few that have existed, do all the can to make themselves popular. Its strong evidence that the west has created this civil war for the sake of taking the massive oil fields of the country.

The “Republic of South Sudan” was created by the US in 2011 and immediately became a miserable failure. The referendum registered 99 percent support for independence and no one batted an eye. In 2012, this “state” lost about half of its GDP. Inflation was usually around 200 percent. Clearly, this is a failed state not in the interests of anyone living there. Of course, they gave their oil to the west, so they received the legitimacy Bashir never had. What little wealth they had was sent to the US.

The first organized foreign protest against Bashir came on July 14th 2004 as a “Darfur Emergency Summit” organized by the US Holocaust Memorial Museum and the American Jewish World Service at the CUNY Graduate Center in Manhattan. Elie Wiesel for some reason was the main speaker. This is where the “Save Darfur” movement originated. No one knows how Wiesel became an expert on Sudanese politics or what he has to do with anything.

Its the “Janjaweed Militia” that's been at war with the “rebel groups.” The term means “devils on horseback” and is what the “rebels” call them, not what they call themselves. The term, as Kurdt writes, “sounds evil,” so this is the name the press used for them. This is a common method of propaganda, as “ISIS” proves. “ISIS” is a Hollywood “bad guy” name because it has two “s” sounds, which remind the hearer of a snake. To have an enemy group “sound” evil is essential in building popular support.

The Russia connection is what brought the CIA to overthrow Bashir. He invited the Russian military into Sudan. He stated that the US was fomenting rebellion in southern Sudan and he needed Russian help. It would have become Russia's “key to Africa.” Sudan is highly strategic. Its located at the intersection of North and East Africa, and it also has crucial maritime placement on the western shores of the Red Sea and is thus close to China’s New Silk Road. China seeks to build a trans-Saharan railway from Sudan's port cities to Chad in order to rebuild the infrastructure needed for greater levels of trade with China and other eastern states.

It should also be noted that, in 2015, a Russian company discovered large deposits of gold in Sudan. At the Sochi Olympiad, Bashir granted Russian firms mining rights to these new mines. In November 2017, Sudan’s Ministry of Minerals signed a contract with, M Invest, a Russian firm backing mining investments. M Invest is based in Petrograd. Shortly afterwards, Sudan bought a number of the fourth generation SU-24 Russian fighters, as part of a deal for equipment upgrades. The deal was worth about \$1 billion. Mr Bashir also invited Russia to build

a naval base in Sudan to would offer critical access to the Red Sea. Under pressure from the US, Djibouti denied a Russian request for a naval base, though the Chinese have one there already.

Once Bashir visited Syria after Assad one his war against the western-backed militias of the region, the CIA created “anti-government” protests as a result, starting almost the very day he returned. Bashir rightly accused the west of trying to “Balkanize” his country into five, tiny states that would then hand over their oil to the US, since they'd be too weak to do anything else. Five states was the official CIA “solution” to the war they created in Sudan. Russia too said the protests were artificial, part of American meddling.

Andrew Korybko writes:

Altogether, the destabilization of Sudan could undermine China’s Silk Road connectivity plans for Africa as well as spill over into the neighboring countries of [the Central African Republic] CAR, South Sudan, and Ethiopia, all of which are currently struggling with various degrees of unrest of as it is. Russia and Turkey’s strategic interests in the Red Sea region and their Sudanese gateway into the Sahel could also be jeopardized, as could the foothold that Qatar is trying to establish on the other side of the Arabian Peninsula [if Bashir is overthrown]. While the GCC [the US backed Gulf Cooperation Council] might lose a valuable military ally in the War on Yemen, Sudan’s collapse could conceivably be to their benefit if it spoils Turkey and Qatar’s plans.

This is the American mentality of its intervention here. This explains the sudden interest in Sudan and charges of “genocide.” The script is identical to all other color revolution scams. As of this writing, a military junta has taken control of Khartoum, but western backing remains murky. This got rid of Bashir for the moment, but the US still opposes the junta on principle. They still might maintain ties with Russia. It all depends on how close the junta is willing to work with the US. Clearly, the military was and is against the creation of “South Sudan,” so the issue is far from settled.

The absurdity that “popular protests” cannot figure out that Sudan's economic woes are not of its own creation generally shows foreign interference. If anything, the protesters would be fighting the west. Certainly, many are and many are vehemently against the creation of “South Sudan.” Those not under the thumb of western corporations no doubt realize this. Even more, according to Marcel Plichta writing in the *World Politics Review* (2019) “Sudan secured loans in excess of \$300 million in mid-March from the UAE-based Arab Monetary Fund and Arab Trade Financing Program. Qatar released a statement of support for the Sudanese regime in late January following a visit by Bashir.” Bashir had the support of the Arab world and was doing all he could to restart an economy artificially vitiating by the west.

Time magazine reported in an interview with Bashir that he was stepping down as president. He was going to leave anyway, but not fast enough for BP or Shell. Yet, this still would have led to an electoral victory for his Congress Party, since Bashir, due to western attacks on the country and the irrational behavior of the southern “rebel groups,” remained generally popular. In that interview, Bashir said,

We are not concerned with the ICC except for one issue: The methods that the Court followed had a dangerous impact in signaling a message to the armed rebel groups that they should not reach peace with this government because its president

is wanted by international justice, which will definitely lead to the government's fall, and therefore there is no need to talk to the government which is perceived to have the international community against it. This is the most dangerous thing with this court.

The ICC is a political court and not a court of justice, because the decision to refer the issue of Darfur to the ICC exempts American citizens from appearing in front of the Court with the excuse that America is not a member of the Rome Statute. We are not members of the [Rome] Statute. It is a political issue of the first degree and not a matter of justice because [achieving] justice has other methods. We are a country that has an old and qualified judicial system that can perform trials. In addition, Darfur has its customs and traditions of conflict resolution that usually override the judicial system because it is able to find the best and ideal solutions to these issues. We think that the ICC is a tool to terrorize countries that the West thinks are disobedient. The African position today, by consensus, is not to cooperate with this court, and it has reached a conviction that this Court is directed against the countries of the Third World and a tool of neo-colonialism.

He's correct, which is why he will be dead long before he stands before any "court," or he won't be turned over at all. It's possible they'll turn him over for the same reason Ecuador permitted Julian Assange to be arrested, that is, the IMF was holding back a \$3 billion loan unless he was turned over. This is a powerful weapon the "democrats" can use against their opponents.

This is far more tyrannical than Bashir. He permitted southern courts total independence from the north. His federal system enshrines this in law regardless. His constitution was the opposite of tyranny: it was a federalized, decentralized system that could satisfy the most radical separatist. There was no reason to reject this system unless "independence" was never the issue. That this was ignored proves that the west controlled these "protests" root and branch.

Two of the primary issues dominating western thinking on Sudan were, firstly, the close role of China in the oil industry during the 1990s leading to his ouster. Second, Sudan and Iran have developed closer ties than ever and are jointly backing various Palestinian groups in the occupied territories.

Bashir was an embarrassment to the west because he was a successful leader who rejected western development models. His economy was taking off once the war in the south was ended. Rather than create an IMF-style export oriented economy, "Sudan has concentrated on building up its basic infrastructure, in transport, energy and water, as a precondition for industrialization." This is what happens when the state is stronger than private capital, a condition the IMF deplors. Back in 2008 Muriel Mirak-Weissbach wrote:

In the 1990s, Sudan's attempts to develop were hamstrung by financial constraints, exacerbated by the pressures exerted by the International Monetary Fund, to exact payment on debts contracted prior to the accession to power in 1989 of the government of Gen. Omar al-Bashir. The IMF demanded exorbitant monthly payments on the debt, which it calculated in 1993 to be \$1.4 billion, and, after initially refusing to pay, Sudan began to pay off about \$35 million per year. This took a tremendous toll on the economy, but at the same time, the country launched a national development effort, which worked, as Sudan began to pump,

refine and sell its oil. Since then, these increasing oil revenues have provided the means for targeted investment in big infrastructure projects. And the stress is on “big.” Over the past seven years, several giant projects have been started, that are transforming the nation. If Sudan is allowed to continue on its current course, it could positively impact the entire region, and set an example for development throughout the continent.

The IMF was literally trying to destroy the economy. This is why Bashir turned to the east and why he will soon be killed. Even with the “world community” demanding his destruction, he continued to build his economy. He attempted to completely electrify the country and succeeded, through a series of dams built with the Chinese, though “sabotaged by the IMF.” The west was enraged when he raised capital from Arab states rather than western banks. The result was the IMF demanded immediate payment of all debt.

The Central Bank of Sudan was created by the Federal Reserve upon independence in 1964, but was nationalized in 1970. It was brought under Sharia law in 1984 and usury was forbidden. Barclay's bank was thrown out of the country for their refusal to accept Islamic banking.

In South Sudan, its banking is controlled by, among others, the Buffalo Bank, whose board of directors are “unknown.” There are few buffalo in southern Sudan, so this is obviously a New York bank. The Bank of South Sudan is run by Chairman Dier Ngor, educated in Ireland. Albino Othow was educated in Italy and Canada. Odera Ochan was educated with a Masters of Sciences Degree in International Banking and Finance from the University of Loughborough, United Kingdom. These men are essentially foreigners and they make up the bulk of the Bank's Board of Directors. As always, state-centered economies, with proper leadership, are very successful. She writes further:

The implications of Sudan's great leap forward are far-reaching and strategic. First, in the country itself, a fundamental revolution in thinking has taken place. Over the past eight years, thanks to its oil revenues and the helping hand of China, Sudan has jump-started its economy. The impact on the political leadership, as well as the population more broadly, has been striking. Optimism has replaced pessimism, and a new spirit of self-confidence has taken hold. Leaders like former Finance Minister Abdelrahim Hamdi, who, in the early 1990s had been demoralized by IMF and other pressures, are now asserting a healthy, positive sense of aggressiveness, founded on the conviction that the country can make the progress it needs to make. To be sure, as Dr. Ghazi Salahudin Atabani, advisor to the President, told me in Khartoum, there are still problems, especially in ensuring that the benefits of growth be felt tangibly by the entire population, including the lowest economic strata. But the fundamental point is that “contrary to all expectations, of the IMF and others,” economic progress has been made, “by Sudan itself — which makes it all the more dangerous. When others see what has been accomplished, by national will, and with the help of China, India and Malaysia,” he stressed, “then that sends a signal to others, that they could break loose and develop.”

The US seeks to bring people on “war crimes” trials as a displacement technique for its

own crimes. Due to his success, Bashir remained very popular until the present day. Politically, Sudan's strategic location and strong leadership marked Bashir for death. His leadership brought both China and Russia closer to Africa as alternative sources of funding. Other African states, seeing Sudan's success, began to follow suit, and the US panicked. Inventions of “human rights abuses” are typical accusations for nationalist rulers who are both successful and go elsewhere for funding. The US needed to finance “rebel groups” because “sanctions” are usually a gift to states that are far from American borders. They only work on states dependent on the US such as Venezuela. Sudan had almost zero connection to the US.

The American Treasury department has sought to “assist” this thriving country, but as always, as Finance Minister Abdelrahim Hamdi said, the sanctions were hurting the US far more than Sudan. He said that the Treasury Department was willing to assist Sudan so long as “conditions” were met, which include “globalization, privatization, liberalization, women’s rights,” and all the rest. In other words, the US demanded a liberal, weak state that would then be putty in the America's hands. The recent decriminalization of homosexual “marriage” in Botswana – as if this would ever be a priority there – exists because the US under Trump threatened a total cutoff of aid and FDI if they didn't comply. Mirak-Weissbach adds ominously:

The danger inherent in the unfolding crash, is that hegemonic financial interests, desperate to maintain their political clout, will unleash military aggression against those perceived as challenging the old dying order. Not only Iran is targeted. So is China, so is India; so is ultimately Russia. Attacks against Beijing for its cooperation with Sudan are on the increase, with absurd calls for the Chinese government to “use its influence” in Sudan allegedly to solve the Darfur crisis. Furthermore, the hue and cry raised internationally against China’s repression of the Tibetan uprising (itself fomented and nurtured by the war party in the West), is aimed at further isolating China.

This author has been saying this for many years. As the US begins to fall to pieces, it will use its military to attack recalcitrant states. As usual, it will fail and the US will be humiliated again, so another method will have to be used, which was proven in April. Still, a war can leave the target economy in a shambles.

Still, this doesn't mean Russia won't deal with South Sudan. Coming from a position of strength, and with Bashir gone, there are few other options. Reuters says “Other foreign firms active in South Sudan’s oil industry include China National Petroleum Corporation (CNPC), Malaysia’s Petronas and India’s Oil and Natural Gas Corporation (ONGC Videsh).” Russia is allegedly setting up shop in the South regardless of its government. This has no relation to local stability. Since the state really has no viability, these projects are based on the ability of the state to legitimize itself.

Steven Gowans wrote on this subject back in 2007, though his opinion is very relevant today. The United States, starting back then and only has been victorious this year, was demanding a “UN peacekeeping force” to Darfur, a, obvious first step to securing control of the region’s oil fields. American control of Darfur’s petroleum would be massively profitable for the US, on the UN's dime no less. This “UN force” would drive the Chinese out of the region. Washington is using highly exaggerated charges of “genocide” as a justification for “UN intervention” it would control, a la Korea. Peace in the south wouldn't be profitable for American

oil unless Bashir was out and US firms firmly in control of the country. All oil would go for export and none would benefit the Sudanese. This is precisely what happened in Libya.

The civil war was about natural resources. Between the north and the south lie significant oil fields and thus significant foreign interests. The oil revenue is privatized to Western interests as in Nigeria. The north wanted to control these resources because they are situated on the edge of the Sahara desert, which is unsuitable for agricultural development. Oil revenues make up about 70 percent of Sudan's export earnings, and contribute to the development of the country which, unlike the south, does not depend on international aid. Due to numerous tributaries of the Nile river and heavier precipitation in the south of Sudan they have superior water access and fertile land.

Since the African Union is already in the south militarily, the American plan seems redundant. The controlled western press, of course, doesn't mention the AU force in the area. Bashir was the only bar to recolonization. While the US initially supported the AU force, this money was quickly removed, leaving only the EU as a supporter. Gowans writes:

In other places, the practice of the United States, Britain, Germany and other Western powers has been to inflame tensions within countries whose resources and cheap labor make them attractive targets for economic take-over, or whose public policies block or impose conditions on foreign investment and trade. The turmoil is often used as a pretext for intervention. While the real reasons for intervention are inextricably bound up with profit-making opportunities, the stated reasons are invariably presented as being related to selfless humanitarianism.

One of the many absurdities of this situation is the existence of the “Sudanese Professionals Association.” The American press, ignorant and controlled as always, calls this a “coalition of 17 trade unions.” This gives the impression it represents blue collar workers. It does not. The groups under its umbrella include, to name just a few, the Central Committee of Sudanese Doctors, Democratic Lawyers Association, Sudanese Journalists Network, Association of Democratic Veterinarians, University Professors Association, Sudanese Doctors Syndicate, Committee for the restoration of the Engineers Syndicate and the Central Pharmacists Committee. In other words, these are men, educated mostly in the west, that represent only the elite of the country. God knows, we need to always take the Democratic Veterinarians seriously.

On their website, they have an article, “Statement about meeting the US Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs” (June 11 2019). Why would they meet with him? Because he's a key ally and financier of these upper class Jacobins. Their statements are written in perfect English, and not the British English one might expect. Therefore, an American wrote this. There's not the slightest clue that a non-American wrote these, so perfect is the English, including the mastery of idioms. This is a giant red flag.

The US helped create the artificial “South Sudan,” an “independent country” that relies entirely on the US for its weapons. Immediately upon coming into existence, its two main ethnic groups began slaughtering each other. Therefore, all talk of “democracy” is utter nonsense.

The South Sudanese Civil War is ongoing. Its between the forces of the state, President Kiir, and Riek Manchar. In 2013, President Kiir accused Machar of attempting a coup and starting a war. Machar then fled to lead the SPLM opposition splinter group. Fighting broke out between the two factions of the SPLM.

Ugandan troops are fighting along with the state. The UN also has peacekeepers in the country. Most truces have failed. Kiir replaced Machar as First Vice President with Taban Deng Gai, a move designed to split the opposition. Two factions of the Dinka tribe are now at war over this splitting. Gai is loyal to the new state, of course. So far, maybe a half-million have been killed. The state was involved in atrocities, specifically in 2014, or so the west claims.

Kiir is part of the Dinka tribe. The war does have tribal undertones, so the state was a failure from the first. The CIA was aware of this possibility. Today, about three million have been displaced. It's not a country at all. Fighting in the agriculturally wealthy southern region have introduced starvation. Famine is today normal. It never existed under Bashir. It presently has no functional economy.

For the US, former Secretary of State John Kerry claimed "credit" for the independence of South Sudan. American firms made a fortune in the country. As the war raged on, the US appeared impotent. The civil war made about half the South's population refugees in neighboring countries. The oil rich economy finally collapsed. No peace process worked at all. Kurdt summarizes the false narrative about the Darfur genocide:

The "Arab-dominated" government of Sudan, headed by the stereotypical Black African tyrant Omar al Bashir, in response to an uprising, has conducted a genocidal pogrom characterized by racist brutality; incidents of mass rapes, sexual slavery, mass killings and a whole manner of different acts of obscene human depravity have been committed against poor, helpless "ethnic Africans" at the hands of the dreaded, government-sponsored, camel-riding "Janjaweed militia", Bashir's army of racist Arab killers. Perhaps as many as 400,000 have perished in the great horror. The intention behind this ethnic-cleansing pogrom is to replace the uprooted and killed Africans with Arabs imported from other countries.

Northern Sudan had no interest in destroying the infrastructure of its wealthy southern sectors prior to and after independence. Bashir wasn't unpopular in the south as he provided the stability needed for development. No one was deluded enough to think that "independence" meant anything. The 99 percent figure was absurd.

South Sudan has 64 tribes, with the largest being the Dinka, about 40 percent of the population. They control the government of South Sudan, again a fact well known to the CIA in Kenya at the time. The second largest is the Nuer. Other aspects of the war are among nomadic groups fighting over the issue of cattle and grazing land. Many of these tribes have never reached even a modicum of civilized life, for better or worse.

In 2010, Dennis Blair, then United States Director of National Intelligence, issued a warning that "over the next five years, a new mass killing or genocide is most likely to occur in southern Sudan." This was a year before the west sponsored the "independence" referendum. This proves that the US knew what it would entail. It's hard to find a more cynical approach to politics. Korybko says:

Sudan's location is indeed a pivotal one because it's located at the intersection of North and East Africa, and it also has crucial maritime-mainland connectivity potential due to its location on the western shores of the Red Sea and China's New Silk Road plan to build a trans-Saharan railway from Port Sudan to the Chadian capital of N'Djamena in eventually facilitating trade between West Africa and the

People's Republic via this future route.

Another point of geopolitical significance in favor of a potential Russian base in Sudan is that Khartoum is advantageously located between the rival states of Egypt and Ethiopia and therefore in the most logical role to mediate between them. The inclusion of Russia into this format could endow Moscow with the unparalleled potential to "balance" between them and their feuding GCC partners, seeing as how the "Gulf Cold War" has recently spread to the Horn of Africa through the pro-Egyptian UAE's military deployments in Eritrea and the self-declared statelet of "Somaliland" while Qatar has succeeded in patching up its relationship with Ethiopia, all of which is centered on Addis Ababa's ambitious plans to build a controversial dam on the Blue Nile river. Through its prospectively enhanced partnership with Sudan, Russia could therefore manage to mediate not only between Egypt and Ethiopia, but also the UAE and Qatar as well, thereby fulfilling the 21st-century "balancing" role being advanced by the "progressive" faction of Moscow's Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The al-Shifa pharmaceutical factory was destroyed in a missile attack by the US in 1998. The Americans claimed it was making chemical weapons and was linked to al-Qaeda. Ample evidence has since emerged showing the factory had no military purpose at all. American claims were a complete fabrication and the destruction of the factory was aimed at intimidating the Sudanese. It was designed to terrorize the population into rejecting Bashir. It was terrorism in its most pure form. The German ambassador to Sudan, Werner Daum, calculated that the loss of the factory resulted in tens of thousands of deaths from malaria and tuberculosis because of the resultant shortage of life-saving medicines.

The US provided arms for the SPLM's fight against the Khartoum government and has continued to pour weapons into the country following the 2005 US-brokered agreement that ended the civil war. In other words, peace talks were only a cover for the US to rebuild its military infrastructure in the south. That provided for a referendum on southern secession and the creation of a new state in southern Sudan centered on the capital of Juba. The vote for secession has given Obama a platform within Sudan to launch an assault on the Khartoum regime through a proxy force.

The Sudan Peoples Liberation Army was founded by John Garang, an economist. The civil war ended with the Addis Ababa Agreement of 1972 and Garang, like many rebels, was absorbed into the Sudanese military. For eleven years, he was a career soldier and rose from the rank of captain to colonel after taking the Infantry Officers Advanced Course at Fort Benning, Georgia. During this period he took four years academic leave and received a Master's degree in agricultural economics from Iowa State University (ISU).

In 1981, he earned a PhD in Economics from Iowa State University. By 1983, Col. Garang was serving as a senior instructor in the military academy in Wadi Sayedna. He was offered scholarships by the US anywhere he wanted. He was then supported by the communist government of Mengistu Mariam of Ethiopia. When Khartoum helped overthrow that government, all SPLA bases were shut down. Many of Garang's men are from Uganda, an US client state.

Darfur is in western Sudan. The more recent war began at 5:30 am on April 25th 2003, the Darfur genocide arose when the Sudan Liberation Movement and the JEM, which is the largest rebel group in Darfur, entered al-Fashir, the capital city of North Darfur and attacked the sleeping

garrison. For four hours, government troops and civilian employees were slaughtered and the air force destroyed on the ground. Without these resources Sudan would no longer be a viable country.

The whole of Sudan is covered by US sanctions that forbid the export of arms to the country. The US is only permitted to export non-military goods to Sudan including the South. But according to Wikileaks, a cargo of tanks, grenade launchers and anti-aircraft guns captured by Somali pirates in 2008 was intended for the SPLM. They had been sold to them via Kenya, a close US ally in the region and the African headquarters of the CIA. The leaked cables revealed that the US was aware of the shipment.

The “United to Stop Genocide” movement has big pocket donors with assets of almost \$700 billion and a network around the world. Its controlled by the largest corporations in the world. By themselves, they could have solved the problem in Sudan with that sort of money. Massive divestment campaigns took place to pressure companies to pull out of (northern) Sudan.

Hundreds of elite corporations have a network of 200,000 activists in western countries. Many peacekeepers were killed by rebels because they were seizing land that was meant to be taken by corporations, which is why they were there in the first place. Still, Sudan registered growth rates of five percent throughout. Unemployment sits at about 12 percent. The currency was stable, with an interest rate between seven and 12 percent throughout this period.

Susan Garth has written back in 2011

China has been largely responsible for developing the Sudanese oil industry, 80 percent of which is in the south and will come under southern authority once partition takes place. Most of the paved roads in southern Sudan are in the oil fields and were built by Chinese companies. Potentially, the new government could insist on renegotiating contracts and allowing US companies to have a share of its oil resources. The extent of Chinese investment put at risk by the partition of Sudan is immense. The Chinese National Petroleum Company is thought to have invested some \$20 billion in Sudan, which is the source of 30 percent of China’s oil imports. Sudan has a strategic significance for China, and the provocative stance that the Obama administration has adopted threatens to lead to the kind of confrontation that Beijing has so far studiously avoided in Africa. A civil war over control of Sudan’s oil has potential global implications. It may prove to have a profoundly destabilizing impact on international relations.

A separate referendum was supposed to be held in Abyei, a border area, to decide whether it should join the northern or the southern state. This is a very rich area. The US had its proxy army start a war there to keep the population from voting to stay with the north, whose economic record had been proven. No one wanted to be a part of the failed state of South Sudan.

More proof of western control over the politics of the South is from an Al-Jazeera article from three days ago, July 15 2019, “Sudan’s Women Demand Power in New Government” by Michael Atit. The claim is that “women played a key role” in the overthrow of Bashir, which is far from the case, but in the South, they’re demanding 40 percent of the seats in parliament based entirely on gender. Only the US could’ve come up with this one, since nothing in the local culture would ever lend itself to this nonsense. When seeing an article like this, its wise to avoid all reference to abstract procedures and see who stands to gain from this. “Female politicians” in this part of the world will hardly be rural, traditional women. They will be exclusively western-

educated, urbanized foreigners. They might have local names, but they're as closely connected to the tribes of South Sudan as I am.

This is the critical approach to reading news articles that is a rare skill today. To speak of “a female perspective,” as if there is such a thing, is to fall victim to misdirection. When these NGO-linked women take over, it will be the corporate sponsors who will now have direct access to the legislature. While this is a minor issue, it is a significant way for the corporations who control the NGOs and western universities that will now control these seats. The article quotes a western trained journalist in the South, “It is good that the [peace] agreement mentions some percentage for women, be it 30 percent or 40 percent, so there is good signal that women will be given a quota, but it is important to fill this quota with quality representation.” What might this mean? He didn't just utter this randomly. Are there women who are of an inferior quality? This is extremely strong evidence this approach is correct. We are quite aware of what “quality” means in this context.

The peace agreement before the 2011 secession was based on a fair distribution of oil wealth. This was considered an outrage for the US, something noted by Bashir in his speech at the UN in 2006. Peace had been achieved based on the distribution of wealth, proving this as the foundation of the conflict. He said at speech that the war was part of the west's drive to recolonize the wealthier parts of Sudan. Political and economic power was highly decentralized, an agenda accepted by Bashir.

Therefore, the civil war since this treaty had been artificially created. Many of the armed groups in the South opposed this peace agreement. These are the people responsible for the war. These were also sponsored by the west. He was in the process of helping rebuild the south at the time his “genocide” allegedly occurred. Western banks wanted to place all of Sudan into receivership. They thought Sudan's debt was a means of recolonization. He called on the UN, not the USA, to organize the rescheduling of Sudan's debts. As a united state under its federalist constitution, it is very viable and can easily keep up with its debt payments. Without western meddling, Sudan today might well be approaching the first world.

Back in 2006, Bashir sought “real, organic democracy” in Sudan, not an imposed version. He also wanted to reform the structure of the UN Security Council. Its “debt burden,” he said, has placed western banks in a position of colonizing power in Africa. He demanded the cancellation of debts so African states can begin self-financing reform and rehabilitation of its economies. These, Bashir said, should be decided upon by nations, not banks. Both Sudan and Nigeria are countries swimming in oil, but corruption and foreign control has led to this wealth to be sent abroad. Poverty cannot be attacked unless nations take control of this aid assistance, not foreign banks. Actual aid is fairly rare. Rather, “aid” is a tool of political control, very much like debt. In a sense, “aid” gives the aid providers a level of ownership in the recipient state. This is part of the reason why aid almost always fails.

Southern armies have seized border area oil fields with US backing. Even the EU condemned this imperialism from the US. South Sudanese President Salva Kiir wears a cowboy hat that Bush gave to him in 2006, as if to show the close relationship between the two states. Glen Ford writes:

Well, it looks like Obama and the cowboy-hatted President Kiir reached their own agreement: to seize the North's oil fields. South Sudan is a US client state that owes its independence to the US and Europeans and Israel, which was deeply involved in the Sudanese civil war. It is inconceivable that South Sudan would

defy the United Nations and the European Union to invade North Sudan and seize half of its oil reserves without the connivance of the United States. US Ambassador to the UN Susan Rice, who has been calling for the head of Sudanese President al-Bashir since George Bush was in office, will pretend that she is “concerned” with the fighting between the two Sudans, and so will Obama. But US client states like South Sudan don’t invade their neighbors without Washington’s blessing.

Gen. Bashir, now on the dock for war crimes (though not in the ICC's custody), was the only hope for Sudan. Presently, he's considered a “fugitive” from the ICC and even those who toppled him will not extradite him to the ICC. Apparently, there are no courts in Sudan, and foreigners knowing nothing about Sudan get to decide his fate. If he's captured, there's no way the ICC will set him free and apologize for their “error.” It would embarrass them too much and they struggle for legitimacy as it is.

Bashir was fighting a civil war. Jordan and other members of the Arab League have so far refused to turn him over to the ICC, a body they don't recognize, when Bashir visited Jordan back in 2017. While these are signatories of the Rome Statutes, which make them all subjects of the ICC, they did this only to ensure access to international markets. They have no desire to be a part of something that can one day ricochet on them. Bashir's best bet is to run to Russia, China or Syria. All three won't accept the ICC's jurisdiction. Bashir opposed the US attack on Sudan's sovereignty and therefore is in violation of “human rights” law. The arrest warrant has no further regard for anything other than that.

Bashir is charged solely with killing several protesters at the very end of his rule. These riots were organized by private actors and hardly represent Sudanese opinion. Bashir cannot control economic realities emanating from outside the country. One of those killed was an army officer, suggesting this was a shootout, rather than a one sided attack on the Jacobins.

The general had already engaged with the Jacobins to create a transitional authority for free elections. Therefore, as the generals who now run the country say, there was no reason for Bashir to have his men shoot unless there were saboteurs among the crowd. The police and troops used tear gas and shot live rounds into the air. There's no evidence the bullets came from soldiers. It had to be sabotage, since the transition was already in progress. *The New York Times* wrote:

In a statement late Monday, the military said the unrest was caused by “parties seeking to sabotage the revolution,” which it accused of opening fire on both soldiers and protesters. Without identifying the culprits, the military said they were “agitated” by progress in political talks earlier that day. It appeared to be the most concerted attempt yet to break up the popular movement that was instrumental in the removal of Mr. al-Bashir last month. But on the streets of Sudan, where military lines of authority are fluid, it was unclear which armed group was behind the move (Walsh, 2019).

These were the protests that allegedly brought Bashir down on the 11th of April, so they occurred before that date. The article above is from mid-May, a month after his overthrow. The *Times* does admit that the military chain of command since Bashir's ouster have been “fluid,” so no one is quite sure who did what or why. The *Times* writes, “The prosecutor’s office accused

Mr. al-Bashir [sic] and others of “inciting and criminal complicity” in the deaths of demonstrators, according to Sudan’s official news agency.” In other words, like all his arrest warrants, he’s looked at only as an “indirect participant,” which is a meaningless criminal charge. I’ve added a [sic] because Bashir is a legitimately promoted General, not a “Mister.” All anyone saw was gunfire coming from “men wearing military fatigues,” or so says *The Guardian*.

They also write on June 16th: “On Thursday, the military council spokesman, Gen Shamseddine Kabbashi, expressed regret over the crackdown. But the council insisted it did not order the dispersal, saying it had actually planned to purge an area near the protest camp where people were said to sell drugs.” This is very believable, since the Jacobins have seen their agenda largely set in place. At this point, drugs are keeping protests at military headquarters going as they did in Ukraine in 2014.

The US, operating in a dependent Chad, interviews refugees, opponents of the system in Sudan, for information about the events in the South. This is like asking Kim Jong-un for information on the Korean War. This isn't a representative sample of the population, and the US heard what it wanted. In February of 2019, Bashir stated: “We also dissolved the executive organ and formed a new government to carry out special tasks and declared the State of Emergency. . . Further decisions and measures will be taken during the coming few days to enhance the dialogue and prepare the country for the desired transformation.”

In conclusion, Bashir spent most of his time ruling over massive economic growth and profitable trade with China and Russia. He was going to be a part of the Silk Road. He might have been the icon for all African development, the first to bring Africa out of poverty. So the US funded southern rebels to destroy the economy and turn the south into a miserable, failed state, but not before the US seized the oil fields there. As Ford says, there's no way the South would take the North on without American backing, especially since the South has no money.

The Jacobins will turn him over in exchange for money and jobs at banks and elite corporations. The military refuse because it would be a very unpopular move. Bashir himself is from the lower classes, his father being a “cow milker.” Like so many military leaders, he saw the army as a way to better his life chances. As always, the Jacobins are from the upper classes. These fights are always a class war.

The NGO World Food Program states:

Approximately 5.5 million people [in Sudan] were food insecure in early 2018 - up from 3.8 million in 2017. It is estimated that more than 80 percent of the population may already be unable to afford the food they need on a daily basis to live a healthy life. The chronic malnutrition rate is 38 percent, with 11 out of 18 states recording the stunting prevalence among children at above 40 percent.

As if this just happened without a cause. The cause is very clear. Under Bashir, this wasn't the case. In fact, the country was increasingly prosperous. If this is “democracy,” and it is, then we can't help but believe men in this country will turn against it. Starvation in the South, and even parts of the northern regions, can be laid directly at the feet of western oil firms, liberalism and capitalist militarism. The WFP is underwritten by MasterCard, American Express and a gaggle of western banks, but the largest donors are the US government and the EU. In an irony of bizarre proportions, Sudan, under Bashir, was the 77th largest donor to this very organization.

Unfortunately, the North too, has a currency crisis. As sanctions force countries to go

elsewhere for oil, hard currency is hard to come by. Since the bank is state owned, the private sector worldwide will not help the bank except to destroy it. Back in November, the Sudanese Pound was devalued and austerity imposed on the country due to western attacks on the country. Hence, Bashir or his successors had nothing to do with this. It was a crisis created in Brussels and Washington DC. Sudan lost two-thirds of its export earnings since the South was forcibly created by the west in 2011. The banks were very much aware that the creation of the Republic of South Sudan would destroy the north, which is why it was created at all.

Saudi Arabia and the UAE have promised another \$3 billion to stabilize the country. This is based on the stability that only Bashir could have brought about. With him gone, this cash is now in abeyance. No one's going to give money to an unstable country – unlike the US with Albania or Ukraine – since the chances of any repayment are non-existent. The only possibility there would be to hold up this cash so long as an Islamic state takes over and brings some discipline to the North. Even if the money disappears, it remains a powerful weapon.

Somehow, the Jacobins think the overthrow of Bashir would have something to do with the currency crisis. Yet, his overthrow has nothing to do with the fact that its oil has been exported by western firms and taken over in the 2011 “independence movement.” Blaming Bashir makes no sense. Having some kind of liberal democracy in this war torn country makes even less sense, but the west has permitted hopes to soar that a political change will do anything for economics. Bashir was going to step down in 2020 anyway. The whole thing is absurd.

Since the wealth of the South has been expropriated, the entire independence gambit was a farce. It is a stage-play run by western powers for the sole purpose of keeping China away from Sudan's oil. Like Kosovo and elsewhere, the state is today run by foreigners. The country has negative economic growth and the American proxy armies are at war with each other. All American guarantees were taken back as the economy collapses. Chances are, like Nigeria or Chad, South Sudan will see its own oil industry collapse while the world is distracted by the “war crimes” of a man fighting a brutal civil war he did not create.

Mission accomplished.

Brief Bibliography

Bashir, Omar (2006) Sudanese President Speech to the United Nations General Assembly. CSPAN (video, in English)
<https://www.c-span.org/video/?194353-8/sudanese-president-speech>

Sudan Tribune. Omer Hassan Ahmed Al-Bashir. Africa Confidential
<http://www.sudantribune.com/+Omar-Hassan-al-Bashir,126-+>

Dealey, S (2009) Omar al-Bashir Q&A: “In Any War, Mistakes Happen on the Ground.” Time
<http://content.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1916262-2,00.html>

James, R (2009) Sudanese President Omar Hassan al-Bashir. Time
<http://content.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1883213,00.html>

Eboe-Osuji, Judge (2019) Judgment of the Appeals Chamber. *The Prosecutor v Al-Bashir*. The Hague, Office of the Prosecutor
<https://www.icc-cpi.int/itemsDocuments/Jordan-Summary-Al-Bashir-Judgment.pdf>

Office of the Prosecutor, ICC (2017) Twenty-fifth Report Pursuant to Paragraph 8 of UN Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1593
https://www.icc-cpi.int/itemsDocuments/170609-otp-rep-UNSC_ENG.pdf

Tarfusser, Cuno, Presiding Judge, et al (2016) The Situation in the Case of Darfur, Sudan: *Prosecution versus Omar al-Bashir*. International Criminal Court. ICC-02/05-01/09
https://asp.icc-cpi.int/iccdocs/asp_docs/Non-coop/ICC-02-05-01-09-266-ENG.pdf

Office of the Prosecutor (2019) Questions and Answers Regarding: *The Prosecutor v. Omar Hassan Ahmad Al Bashir*. ICC-02/05-01/09
<https://www.icc-cpi.int/itemsDocuments/190515-al-bashir-qa-eng.pdf>

Johnston, W (2019) More Than Just Oil and Gold Informing Russia Decision to back Bashir. The East African
<https://www.theeastafrican.co.ke/oped/comment/Why-Russia-is-backing-Sudan-Omar-Bashir/434750-5021178-ga4fsxz/index.html>

Walsh, D (2019) Sudan’s Omar al-Bashir Charged in Connection With Killing of Protesters. NYT, May 13

Vansina, J (1962) A Comparison of African Kingdoms. Africa: Journal of the International African Institute

Plichta, Marcel (2019) Why Russia Is Standing By Sudan’s Bashir. World Politics Review.
<https://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/27714/why-russia-is-standing-by-sudan-s-bashir>

Ford, G (2012) The West Wants to Take the Rest of Sudan's Oil. Center for Research on Globalization
<https://www.globalresearch.ca/the-west-wants-to-take-the-rest-of-sudan-s-oil/30457>

Kurdt, R (2009) Genocide in Darfur: Psyops Deconstruction. Center for Research on Globalization
<https://www.globalresearch.ca/genocide-in-darfur-psyops-deconstruction/14299>

Garth, S (2011) US Talks Peace and Prepares for War in Sudan. Center for Research on Globalization
<https://www.globalresearch.ca/us-talks-peace-and-prepares-for-war-in-sudan/25300>

Korybko, A (2018) The Sudan, Africa's Longest Civil War: The Peace Deal Proves that South Sudan Is a Failed Concept. Center for Research on Globalization
<https://www.globalresearch.ca/the-sudan-africas-longest-civil-war-the-peace-deal-proves-that-south-sudan-is-a-failed-concept/5645658>

Korybko, A (2018a) Sudan Might be the Next Geopolitical Victim of the New Cold War. Center for Research on Globalization
<https://www.globalresearch.ca/sudan-might-be-the-next-geopolitical-victim-of-the-new-cold-war/5663940>

Korybko, A (2019) The Consequences of the Sudanese Coup. Center for Research on Globalization
https://www.globalresearch.ca/consequences-sudanese-coup/5674143?utm_campaign=magnet&utm_source=article_page&utm_medium=related_articles

Mirak-Weissbach, M (2011) A New Asian-African Alliance? China supports Sudan's Economic Growth. Center for Research on Globalization
<https://www.globalresearch.ca/a-new-asian-african-alliance-china-supports-sudan-s-economic-growth/8422>

Gowans, S (2009) Will Sudan be Re-Colonized? Center for Research on Globalization
<https://www.globalresearch.ca/will-sudan-be-re-colonized/5971>