



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on February 4, 2017

UN and CFR Seek to Impose UN Regime on South Sudan

Amid an ongoing conflict in South Sudan between the national government and an opposition group, the United Nations, the [African Union](#), and the [global governance-promoting Council on Foreign Relations](#) have touted a plot to impose a UN-created regime on the sovereign African nation. In short, the nation would be put under what is being termed a “UN trusteeship,” without its consent. While most of the world’s media outlets have expressed little interest in the Sudanese crisis, the proposed globalist “solution” has far-reaching implications that could set a very dangerous precedent for self-government and national sovereignty. Top globalists have even touted the scheme as a possible “model” for other nations.



The call to put South Sudan under the rule of a UN-created regime first appeared in November of 2016. “The only remaining path to protect [South Sudan’s] sovereignty and territorial integrity, restore its legitimacy, and politically empower its citizens is through an international transitional administration, established by the United Nations and the African Union (AU), to run the country for a finite period,” argued Katherine Almquist Knopf, director of the Africa Center for Strategic Studies, in a [Special Report](#) for the Council on Foreign Relations funded by a grant from the globalist Carnegie Corporation of New York. Why a government should “run” a country at all was not clear.

{modulepos inner_text_ad}

South Sudan is the world’s youngest country, [becoming independent just over five years ago](#) following almost unanimous public support in a referendum for splitting from the mass-murdering Islamist regime in the North. The current conflict raging in South Sudan began in late 2013. As is typical of such conflicts, both sides have their own versions of what happened, with each accusing the other of instigating the problem. What is clear, though, is that then-First Vice President Riek Machar decided to separate from the government of President Salva Kiir and launch an armed uprising. Since then, several peace agreements have collapsed, fighting has continued, and the nation has remained divided.

Under the proposed plan outlined in the CFR report, South Sudan’s government would be disbanded, and a new one created by foreigners would be imposed by force. As part of that effort, a “peace intervention force of soldiers and police,” along with a “joint UN-African Union executive administration,” would “provide basic services, oversee financial operations, and appoint ministers and personnel,” according to the report, headlined [Ending South Sudan’s Civil War](#). The plan would also force Kiir and Machar out of power, while dismantling the nation’s current institutions. The report estimates that the UN-AU regime would be in place for ten to 15 years.

Establishment globalist Richard Haass, the controversial president of the CFR, acknowledges in the forward that the proposed plot is “anything but guaranteed to work.” But it is worth “serious



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on February 4, 2017

consideration,” he said, because it could represent “a model for what might well be needed elsewhere in Africa, the Middle East, and in other parts of the world when counties prove unable to govern themselves.” Plus, he says, the U.S. taxpayer and others are already spending “billions of dollars” on aid and support for South Sudan, and imposing an “international transitional administration” on the people of that nation “promises better returns for the United States, the United Nations, and other donors.”

According to the CFR report outlining the plan, resistance to the UN-AU regime foisted on South Sudan would be met with violence and manipulation. “Opposition to a UN and AU transitional administration could be mitigated through a combination of politics and force — by working with important South Sudanese constituencies frustrated with President Salva Kiir, former First Vice President Riek Machar, and their cronies; and then deploying a lean and agile peace intervention force to combat and deter the remaining spoilers once they have been politically isolated,” the report argues coldly.

In South Sudan itself, critics on both sides of the conflict have lambasted the UN’s globalist plot as reflecting an elitist, colonial attitude that views Africans as incapable of sorting out their own affairs without help. President Kiir, in particular, has long blasted the UN, the UN Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS), and its interference in his country. In early 2014, for example, shortly after the start of the conflict, he accused the UN and other outfits of allegedly supporting and encouraging opposition leader Machar’s plot to overthrow the government. Indeed, the interference was so extreme, Kiir said, that the UN was acting like a “parallel government” and even sheltering opposition fighters on UN bases.

“If that is the position of [then-UN Secretary-General] Ban Ki Moon, he should make it clear that he wants the UN to take over South Sudan,” Kiir [said at the time](#), openly suggesting that the UN may have been behind Machar’s decision to launch an armed rebellion against his government. In the same press conference, he said Machar had launched a campaign of mass murder and terror with aid from the UN. Pro-government protesters in March of 2014 flooded the streets, accusing the UN of arming the revolutionaries against Kiir, who won 93 percent support in the South Sudanese election that brought him to power.

Whether the UN has been arming and supporting the rebels is difficult to confirm. But a UN MISS truck packed with weapons was intercepted by the government on its way to rebel-held areas, a violation of the UN’s own rules. In a statement, the UN mission claimed that it was supposed to be a shipment of “general goods” and that “several containers were wrongly labeled and inadvertently contained weapons and ammunition.” The statement, apologizing for the “mistake,” called the incident “regrettable.” Protesters quoted by Voice of America [said](#) the UN’s mission, rather than peacekeeping, had become a “war-and-worse instigating mission.”

Before the CFR report, similar plans to put South Sudan and its vast oil wealth under a UN regime were floated shortly after the start of the conflict. But South Sudanese officials rejected the calls outright. “This is just nonsense that we rejected,” said Vice President James Wani Igga about the plot to have Kiir step down, dissolve the government, and put the nation under UN so-called protection. “The other suggestion was even worse, which is to consider South Sudan as a U.N. protectorate. They want us to become a UN Colony. If they want to force us to be colonized again, I swear to God even an old man like me will return to the bush as a rebel.”

More recently, Kiir met this week in Ethiopia with the new UN boss, socialist and globalist Antonio Guterres, who apparently took a different tone that was appreciated by Kiir. “At the United Nations, we are equal members, regardless of whether a country is young, old, big or small,” [said](#) Kiir, who has been accused by critics of dictatorial tendencies and who raised the ire of Western establishment types in



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on February 4, 2017

part due to his firm opposition to homosexuality. “There is a way to do things but some people within the United Nations took it as our weakness and they continued to behave as if South Sudan a protectorate state of the United Nations so we get orders from them.”

The proposed UN regime for South Sudan, rejected even by other African governments as a reflection of a “colonial mentality” that would face opposition from both Kiir and Machar, would be imposed in conjunction with the African Union. But as *The New American* has documented extensively, the so-called “African Union” is not even an African project. Instead, it is [an autocratic and artificial construct imposed on Africans](#) by the brutal Communist Chinese dictatorship and the globalist establishment in London, Brussels, Washington, D.C., and beyond. The AU headquarters was literally financed by the regime in Beijing.

And as if to highlight the absurdity of the would-be continental regime, in 2015 [genocidal mass-murderer Robert Mugabe, the Marxist dictator of Zimbabwe, was selected to serve as “chairman” of the outfit](#). However, the continental regime, [similar in many ways to the European Union](#), the [Eurasian Union](#), the [Union of South American States](#), and other regional blocs, is [a key globalist tool in the effort to smash nation states on the road toward what the establishment touts as the “New World Order.”](#) Like its counterparts in other regions, the AU is already [operating a military force and a continental “parliament” while working to impose a single currency and continent-wide policies](#) developed by unaccountable foreign technocrats.

Under the proposed scheme to impose a UN-AU regime on South Sudan, which even the author of the CFR report acknowledges sounds “radical,” South Sudan would not be the first internationally recognized sovereign nation to have a UN regime foisted on it from outside. “If this idea seems at all familiar, it might be because of its similarities to the trusteeships envisioned by the United Nations after World War II for entities making the transition from colony to independent country,” the CFR report states. But of course, South Sudan is not a colony. And, as critics have pointed out, the UN-AU regime would, ironically, make South Sudan akin to a colony of the dictator-dominated UN.

More recently, the report cites several other examples of UN regimes being imposed on sovereign nations, including Cambodia, where, for the first time ever, the UN took over the administration of an independent state, allegedly for “its own good.” Today, Cambodia remains mired in poverty and is still ruled by a savage communist dictator from the Khmer Rouge regime, which exterminated between 25 percent and 50 percent of the nation’s population in a bloody drive to create “utopia.” As if to emphasize the danger of such UN schemes, the report also notes that East Timor and Liberia similarly had UN-created regimes foisted on them. The results can be witnessed today — poverty, tragedy, poor governance, and worse.

The UN’s use of force to obtain compliance would also not be unprecedented. In Katanga, a Western-minded Congolese province that declared independence to avoid living under a Soviet-backed, mass-murdering communist dictator, UN “peace” forces [waged a horrifying war — complete with savage war crimes, bombing of hospitals, bayoneting children, and other atrocities — to force the people of Katanga to submit](#). While the atrocities have been left out of history textbooks, the documentation is widely available.

More recently, in the Ivory Coast, the UN refused to accept the decision of that nation’s high court regarding an election. Instead, it sent in UN “peace” troops, infamous worldwide for raping children, and [provided military support to Islamist militias that butchered thousands of Christians](#). The UN eventually arrested the Christian president, and replaced him with a Muslim central banker. In a survey



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on February 4, 2017

by Save the Children, [eight out of 10 underage girls in one Ivorian town occupied by UN troops admitted to being raped and sexually exploited by the alleged “peace” forces.](#)

The CFR’s support for putting South Sudan under UN-AU control should also be cause for alarm. The outfit and its members, along with its sister organizations, have played a crucial role in bringing numerous dictatorships and oppressive regimes to power. And as defectors from the organization have long warned, [the CFR has a thoroughly anti-American agenda.](#) U.S. Admiral Chester Ward, who resigned in disgust from the globalist outfit when he realized its agenda, said that the CFR’s goal was the “submergence of U.S. sovereignty into an all powerful one world government.” He also noted that the “lust to surrender the sovereignty and independence of the United States is pervasive throughout most of the membership.”

In short, the agenda to impose a UN-AU regime on South Sudan is dangerous on many fronts. To understand the danger posed by the CFR proposal, imagine if the UN had existed during the American Civil War and had decided to sideline the American people’s elected officials in favor of a “transitional government” appointed by the world’s dictators and foreign governments. Imagine, too, if the UN could seize on any civil conflict — even one stirred up by globalists, communist agitators, or its own minions — as a pretext for putting a nation and its people under UN rule. The dangers should be obvious.

Photo of UN armored vehicle in South Sudan: AP Images

Alex Newman, a foreign correspondent for The New American, is normally based in Europe. He can be reached at anewman@thenewamerican.com. Follow him on Twitter [@ALEXNEWMAN_JOU](#).

Related articles:

[Troubled South Sudan Officially Independent](#)

[In African Union, Globalist Agenda Becomes Clear](#)

[African Union Unveils Biometric Passport for New World Order](#)

[Globalists Push EU-style “Union” for Middle East](#)

[U.S. Independence Attacked as Never Before by UN Interdependence](#)

[EU, World Bank Brutalize Africans for “Carbon Credits”](#)

[UN-backed Forces Slaughter Christians in Ivory Coast](#)

[Globalists Push EU-style “Union” for Middle East](#)

[Carbon Scam by UN and World Bank Behind “Genocidal” Land Grabs](#)

[Murderous Marxist Tyrant Mugabe to Lead African Union](#)

[The EU: Regionalization Trumps Sovereignty](#)

[Globalist Henry Kissinger Outlines “New World Order”](#)

[The United Nations: On the Brink of Becoming a World Government](#)

[UN Panics Amid Growing Scandal on Child Rape by “Peace” Troops](#)

[Council On Foreign Relations Exposed](#)



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.

Subscribe