



## International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: [www.ijrpr.com](http://www.ijrpr.com) ISSN 2582-7421

# International Imperialism and Eco-Political Globalization Schemes for the Division of Sudan

*Samir Muhammad Ali Hassan Alredaisy*

University of Khartoum, Faculty of Education, Department of Geography

Email: [samiralredaisy1@gmail.com](mailto:samiralredaisy1@gmail.com)

### ABSTRACT

This research aims to clarify some of the global imperialist plans to divide Sudan as an integral part of the policy of political-economic globalization to control the world. The British colonial administration in Sudan laid the first building blocks for division by implementing the policy of closed areas and cultural separation between northern Sudan, the regions of southern Sudan, the Nuba Mountains, and the Anqasana region. After the British left, the environment was suitable for rebellion, which worked to separate South Sudan in 2011 AD after a long civil war. It followed the Israeli policy towards supporting the rebellion in South Sudan since 1955, then supported the rebellion in the Darfur region, and it has a plan to divide Sudan into five small states to benefit from its natural resources and weaken Sudan's role in supporting the Palestinian problem. American policy adopted re-dividing the Middle East, including Sudan, into small, weak states, where the Arab Spring revolutions began. Under the policies of global imperialism and its arm known as globalization, Sudan has become under the hammer of division into small states. Sudan's failure to achieve political governance and the lack of a clear foreign policy during most of the period of independence from British colonialism, in addition to its inherent developmental and ethnic problems since its formation as a state in 1956 AD, created appropriate opportunities for global imperialism to develop its plans to divide it. Sudan must thwart all these plans by formulating a joint political-social contract between all its ethnic and political components to achieve political stability and build the future state.

**Keywords words:** partition of Sudan, global imperialism, globalization, exploitation of resources

### Introduction

Sudan was formed due to historical events that created a geographical composition that differed in its natural environments, ethnic and religious composition, and the political orientations of its population. Sudan was subjected to British colonialism, which was able to formulate a philosophy of capitalist economic development and impose policies of ethnocultural separation on some parts of Sudan, which provided a suitable environment for rebellion and the pursuit of secession. The forces of modern global imperialism have taken this imperialist ground as a base to seek to divide Sudan into small, weak, and warring states in order to be able to exploit its natural and human resources in the service of the plans of political-economic globalization. Hence, this research seeks to review some of the plans of global imperialism and political-economic globalization to divide Sudan since the period of British colonialism in Sudan and the historical periods that followed.

### Theoretical framework

Economic globalization has effects on jurisdiction territoriality, or in more theoretical terms, "the exclusive territoriality of the nation-state". This is an effort to respond critically to two ideas behind much of the debate about globalization. The first idea is the zero-sum game, which holds that where the global economy wins, the nation-state loses, and vice versa. As for the second idea, events that occur on national borders are considered national events if they take the form of a commercial settlement, a judicial decision, or any other form (Sassen, 2000). The traditional assumption holds that the borders of money are linked to the political fronts of the populist state, as we find France linked to the franc, the United Kingdom to the pound sterling, and the United States to the dollar. The imbalance between this simple mental landscape and the real system of currency spaces has grown and developed in recent years due to the role played by the borders of states in limiting currency circulation. The contemporary geography of money is concerned with financial and political power, as modern financial transformations create a challenge to state sovereignty. International political and economic relations have been dramatically reshaped by the increasing interpretations of national monetary spaces, creating tensions and insecurities and creating opportunities for cooperation (Cohen, 2018). Governmentality usually investigates the relationship between the production of governmental rationalities and modern power. Many geographers place governmentality within the mechanisms of knowledge that states have used to construct their subjects and borders as "government." It can also be argued that an analysis of governmentality can explore how non-state workers use government-owned technology in myriad ways (Rose-Rewood, 2006).

According to Michael Foucault, power is considered a lower-ranking property than strategy and is widely distributed across cultural paths and situations. As for Jurgen Habermas, modernity imposes a distinct content of communications that determines the stability of traditional living worlds and brings forth a promise of rationality that is largely unfulfilled. Intellectually speaking, the agency and organization of power cannot be framed separately from each other. He understood the emergence of modernity by understanding the geographical formation of power, where the history of social power necessarily opens up to the analysis of networks of power, their logistics, and their spatial contours. These ideas about power and modernity underscore the importance of historical geography (Harris, 1991).

The shrinking political ground in Africa is attributed to the authoritarian practices of presidential monarchs, where political competition turned into a strong conflict as a result of the absence of stable institutions and political leadership, which was fragmented and failed to find an entity capable of creating a state. As a result of the failure of the first generation of African politicians, the armies intervened to seize power, which went through experiences of division and dispersion and had an unimpressive record that led to a continuous deterioration of the political situation to praetorianism (Wai, 1979). In the Hegelian system there are winners and losers, masters and slaves, and similarly, in the movement of history towards a homogeneous universal state there are winners and losers. Hegel's interest in the condition of individuals and in the historical process of colonialism, cultural confrontation, and domination is not clear. This is very similar to Coetzee's definition of war as "imposing a choice on someone who does not make it." In Hegel's thought, the homogeneous global state, which arrived with the advent of Napoleon, is the pinnacle of the historical process as it will end the dialectic of masters and slaves and will indicate the end of history (Turner, 1990).

---

### **The British plan to divide Sudan**

The colonial policy towards South Sudan was based on weakening the northern presence in the south and weakening the Arabic language, whether by replacing the Arabic language with English or by encouraging the spread of local dialects and converting them into written languages. It can be said that the great powers were inspired by the idea of secession mainly from the geographical background associated with religion and ethnic groups in South Sudan (El Shair, 2015). To achieve this, the British established a policy of administrative separation (1898-1947) between the North and the South. As well as between the north and the regions of the Nuba Mountains and Anqasna, under the pretext of the existence of geographical, political, historical, and cultural differences between them. British colonialism exploited religion to tear apart national unity in Sudan. Christian missionary campaigns in South Sudan were working to spread Christianity and incite against the Islamic religion and portray it as a racist religion (Albdel-Alatif, 1996).

The British issued the Closed Areas Law in 1920, and the Passports and Traffic Permits Law in 1922 to ensure the effectiveness of this policy, so that travelers between the north and the south use passports and traffic permits, while specifying the purpose of the visit. They then passed the Permission and Trade Act in 1925 under which Northern Sudanese were required to obtain permission to trade in South Sudan. Finally, the South Sudan Linguistic Policy was introduced and supported in 1928, which adopted English as the official language, approved the use of local tribal languages, and prohibited the use of Arabic in South Sudan. The cumulative effect of these laws was to keep South Sudan separate from its north, and the colonial rulers of South Sudan usually attended conferences in East Africa instead of Khartoum. After establishing the institutions of dual rule, the British continued to strengthen their position in northern Sudan by creating the necessary administrative and political structures for the north. In an effort by the dual government to prepare the south for self-rule, the Northern Sudan Advisory Council Law was enacted in 1943, which included the six northern governorates: Khartoum, Kordofan, Darfur, Eastern, Northern, and Blue Nile. All members of the council were northerners, and that council had no reference to South Sudan. Instead of establishing an advisory council for Southern Sudan similar to that of Northern Sudan, the decisions of the Administrative Conference for Northern Sudan, which was held in Khartoum in 1947, supported the subordination of Southern Sudan to its north. This conference was not attended by the British administrators in South Sudan, who were not satisfied with the decision that came from that conference.

The British concluded their policies towards South Sudan with the Juba Conference in 1948, which approved the subordination of the South to the North. This decision culminated in the establishment of the Sudanese Legal Assembly in 1948, where thirteen southern negotiators were forced to represent the South in this assembly (Machar, 1995), and the Cairo Conference in 1953 was not an exception. The British had previously considered annexing South Sudan to Uganda or Kenya, but the British rulers of those British colonies refused on the grounds that it would increase burdens on them, especially with regard to the ethnic aspects that distinguish South Sudan from these colonies.

During the colonial period, the Sudanese tried to reject "foreign" sovereignty, which failed in 1924 AD, as the British took the lion's share in shaping the country's fate. At the end of World War II, as a result of the influence of educated Sudanese, like other Africans and Asians, they demanded the right to self-determination. In preparation for achieving destiny, a sample of Western democracy was presented in the form of a consultative council that was limited to northern Sudan only in 1946 AD, and it was followed two years later by the Legislative Assembly, which had more powers. Although these democratic modernizations are considered strange to Sudan and were introduced relatively late, it has remained preserved with traditional institutions.

Until recently, Sudan was composed of a number of tribal units in which there were no social classes or distinctions (divisions), and the head of the tribe did not have a status that differed greatly from the rest of the members of his tribe, and therefore the people were not accustomed to autocratic rule (Hassan, 1967). The new national society in Sudan after the fall of the Sennar Kingdom was tested by the defeat that came from abroad, by the revolution of socio-economic transformations, and by the challenges of contemporary contribution to sub-imperialism, which initially dominated culturally and, in the end, politically over the entire population of modern Sudan. One of this society's important responses to the challenges of this complex era was the invention of a national historical tradition whose members were descended from relatively recent immigrants to Sudan from the well-known Arabs (Eminent Arabs in Islamic Antiquity) (Spaulding, 2000).

In light of the influences of British colonialism, economic developmentalism emerged as an ideology for the Sudanese state in the post-colonial period. As a result of the global change in the tools of economic management and the practice of economic diplomacy, the state transformed from managing the population to managing the national economy based on the principle of individual justice. This ideology was transmitted to the last administrators of the colonial period and then to Sudanese politicians and decision-makers and became a political project for the formation of the Sudanese state, especially in its inability to deal with issues of regional and ethnic justice and civil wars (Young, 2018). It becomes clear when tracing the history and development of colonialism in Sudan (1899-1956), the development of political parties and their allies, and Egypt's efforts to confirm the restoration of Sudan's unity with Egypt, the existence of cooperative relations between imperialism and some local residents (Woodward, 1979). When exploring the origin and growth of the political role of Sudanese businessmen in political and economic development, their alliance with colonialism, to which they remained loyal until its departure from the country, becomes clear. Since independence, the business class and the parties that represent it have opposed radical change to the point that they have no progressive role in the development of Sudan (Mahmoud, 1983).

### The Israeli plan to divide Sudan

Bilateral relations between Sudan and Israel began immediately after Sudan gained its independence in 1956 AD. It is characterized by being "non-aggressive", secretive, and irregular in nature as a result of the political and economic instability in Sudan due to repeated military coups, internal tribal conflict, and the constant conflict between Islamist and secular groups that are partly blamed for Sudan's irregularity in its international relations. The tension in relations between Sudan and Israel decreases to the extent that Khartoum maintains its relationship with the West.

The Israeli Mossad intervened on behalf of the Anyanya 1 movement in the period 1969-1971, when southern politicians asked Israel to assist them in their conflict with the government of Sudan. The Anyanya has turned into a strong army (Africa News Portal, 2015). The matter was done in complete secrecy until the time came when the conflict took on a global dimension, which Israel used against the Arab peoples and the Soviet Union to draw attention away from it after the 1967 war (Gidron, 1971). Since the end of the fifties, Israel has provided much technical support to Uganda and this continued until 1972 when Idi Amin expelled it and adopted a policy hostile to it (Oded, 2006).

Israeli censorship allowed the publication of details of the role of the Mossad in dividing Sudan and arming the South Sudanese army, and the role of General David Ben Uzael (an Israeli Mossad officer) in building the economic military power of South Sudan (Africa News Portal, 2015). Sudan has constituted a thorny crisis since it entered into force. Following the approach of Gamal Abdel Nasser, the Israelis viewed Sudan as an Arab Islamic state, but in reality, it consists of different ethnic groups and contains millions of non-Arabs. The Israeli "Mida" website indicates that the first South Sudanese ambassador to Tel Aviv, "Ruben Marial Benjamin," when he presented his credentials to the president In December 2014, the Israeli "Reuven Rivlin" handed him a letter that stated: "South Sudan was created thanks to you. The South was born thanks to the State of Israel and General John". Salva Kiir Meredit sent a letter to Benjamin Netanyahu informing him that he had chosen General John as his personal representative in Israel after the secession of the State of South Sudan (Figure 1). There are three reasons why Israel is moving towards supporting the state of South Sudan: strengthening the second circle that Israel built around the Arab countries, which includes Turkey, Iran, Ethiopia, and Kenya, preventing connections between Sudanese army units with the Egyptian army, and helping the southern population in confronting Islamic terrorism, as he described it.



Figure 1: Sudan map in 2011

Sudan's possession of conflicting elements and forces since its geographical construction has coincided with Israel's search for different means of penetrating Africa which it considers part of its ambitions and its need to support African countries in confronting Arab and Islamic countries. Among the fruits of this, for example, was the process of expelling the Falasha Jews from Ethiopia in small numbers between 1979 and 1982, which developed into a major operation between 1983 and 1985, which took place more from Sudan than from Ethiopia where they live. With funding from the American government, Israel, and organizations specializing in supporting the migration of Jews to Occupied Palestine is one of the most important concerns of the Zionist movement (Karadawi, 1991). This was part of the trends that strengthened relations between Sudan and the international community since Jaafar

al-Numeiri seized power in May 1969, which included two stages. The first stage was a short period of symbolic heroic radicalism that preceded the July 1971 coup and was characterized by ideological closeness to the idea of Arab nationalism and fascination with the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries. The second stage was after 1971 AD and was characterized by a closeness to the neoconservatives or what was called the pragmatic orientation, which was characterized by subordination to the West. In fact, the continued absence of a strong internal ideology did not encourage the emergence of a well-accepted foreign policy, which hindered the role of political forces at the local level from progressing towards achieving a development ideology relevant to Sudanese reality (Wai, 1979).

The Israeli thinkers see in the book "Israel and the South Sudan Liberation Movement" that the map of Sudan is made up of minorities where there is no single history that unites them, and that Arab unity is a myth. The result of this is that each nationality will have its own state and Israel will become one of the nation-states in the region. Based on that, Israel divided the countries into surrounding countries, including Egypt, Syria, Jordan, and Lebanon, and peripheral countries, including Turkey, Iran, Iraq, Sudan, Saudi Arabia, and Libya. Israel is focusing on non-Arab groups in Sudan to implement its plan, as the first phase ended with the separation of the south, and now the second phase has begun, which depends on creating an industry of creative chaos as a new scenario in all parts of Sudan to separate Darfur, the Nuba Mountains and then the East, relying on the weakness of the Sudanese economy and benefiting from the effects of the economic blockade and the exploitation of extremist groups and ideas to distort the Sudanese political image, which adopts Sharia law for rule so that the country reaches the brink of extreme high prices and then collapse (Alawiya Al-Shammar Dictionary, 2013).

Israeli policy moves according to a complex set of declared and undeclared goals. Israel has followed various methods to prevent the Red Sea from becoming an Arab lake, either by occupying, controlling, and creating instability in it, or taking advantage of global changes and regional balances. It is known that international variables have a direct impact on vital regions in the Middle East and on Sudan in particular, especially in light of the political complexities between the conflicting parties and the search for vital geographical areas. Relations have arisen between the Horn of Africa and the Arabian Gulf region due to the regional extension of the Horn of Africa and its proximity to the Arabian Gulf region, as it had positive aspects such as communication, cooperation, and historical connection, and negative aspects highlighted by international conflicts due to the strategic location of the two regions, which affected them both (Yahya, 2015). Saudi Arabia and the Gulf states seek to ensure regional military balance, security, and internal stability (Cordesman, 2019). This was at a time when internal and external factors in Sudan and Iran stimulated relations between the two countries, resulting in a civilizational, cultural, political, and economic expansion between them that linked them together within the framework of African-Asian relations (Cordesman, 2019).

Because there are no borders between Israel and Sudan, it has made Sudan part of its broad strategy because it believes that the presence of a unified Sudan will support the Palestinian and Arab issues and help support the balance of power in favor of the Arabs. This policy is superior to the "divide and rule" policy used by British colonialism in its dealings with minorities and separatist movements in Sudan. The African continent and the Middle East region have gone through experienced secessionist movements carried out by local nationalities in the past decades, mostly supported by external interests and concerns to achieve their political or economic imperialist goals. In this context, the forces of the left and right struggled to decide to resolve the national issue in South Sudan. It achieved some success during the first two years of Jaafar al-Numeiri's rule (1969-1985) when the government leaned towards programs dependent on Western aid and investment, which was accompanied by violent repression of the Sudanese military and organized unions and of the Sudanese Communist Party in 1971 AD. This repression reflects the conflict between Numeiri's government and the Sudanese popular forces over which social classes should lead the struggle for social change. This led to the strong alliance between Sadat's Egypt and the rich oil-producing Arab countries as partners in Sudan's economic development. These countries see Sudan as a showcase for agribusiness in the Middle East. Whatever the promise of such development trends, they represent the most important economic and political changes in Sudan since the entry of British colonialism at the end of the nineteenth century (Collins, 1976).

Israel's role in making South Sudan become a state became clear, in addition to its support for the rebellion in Darfur (Muttalak, et al., 2019). Developments and events revealed its involvement in supporting the rebel movements in Darfur by training the rebels and supplying them with weapons. Israel even made the issue of intervention in Sudan a priority. Its foreign policy is to preoccupy Sudan with its internal problems and then keep it from playing a pivotal role in regional issues. In addition to its ambitions in the Darfur region, whose area is equivalent to 20% of the area of Sudan, and is linked by international roads to Egypt and Libya, it contains about 69 million tons of high-purity uranium ore, which is the third or fourth-largest uranium stockpile in the world (Al-Sahli, 2018). The plan to separate the Darfur region from Sudan is intended as the second step in the partition plot. Abdul Wahid Muhammad Nour had previously announced from his movement's headquarters in Tel Aviv that, in the event of the establishment of the Darfur state, he would grant Israel an exclusive privilege to explore and extract uranium, gold, and oil in the nascent state, as he would be its prospective president. It is expected that the Kordofan region will be a victim of partition at a later stage, followed by the stripping of Sudan of the eastern part of the country. In the event of the separation of Darfur, the area of Sudan will decline again from 1.8 million square kilometers to 1.3 million square kilometers. If the Kordofan region is separated, the area of Sudan will decline to 900 thousand square kilometers. If the East separates, the area of Sudan will become 500 thousand square kilometers, turning into Five mini-states based on religious, ethnic, and tribal foundations.

In confirmation of what was mentioned above, Israeli intelligence reports and studies revealed the Zionist entity's focus on Sudan since its independence, and its failure to achieve the stability and economic development that would make it an Arab and African regional power. It created the circular alliance represented by Uganda, Ethiopia, Eritrea, and Zaire, in addition to weakening Sudan by creating crises, separating the south, and paving the way for the secession of Darfur. Their allies in the south are able to implement Israel's agenda in Sudan, and a large and important amount of the Israeli goals in Sudan have been achieved, at least in South Sudan. Especially since Sudan represents a strategic depth for Egypt (Dirar, 2020). The fear of dividing Sudan and declaring the state of the South is not a fear for the North alone, but it is a double fear for a South that may not find protection and a North that may not find stability. If we add to that the Darfur crisis, its uncertain future, and what awaits Kordofan, we realize that the winds of division will not

stop in South Sudan. What is happening in South Sudan is similar to what happened in the 1920s at the hands of England and France as they jointly divided what remained of the Ottoman Empire (Juwaida, 2011).

Sudan comes at the top of the list of countries targeted by the “New Middle East” strategy, and the creative chaos based on dividing countries into warring mini-states on religious and ethnic lines. There is an Israeli plan to establish a Kushite state in Sudan according to specific timetables and carefully prepared steps. The state of South Sudan is considered the first stage to act as a lever for the demolition of the old state. As for the second phase of the Israeli plan, which began its implementation, the establishment of the so-called independent and sovereign Republic of Central Sudan extends from Umm Dafuq in South Darfur in the west to Kurmuk in the east, passing through the Kauda region. This plan aims to flood the Second Sudanese Republic with a number of sectarian conflicts and wars, deepen the concept of apostasy to tribal and ethnic loyalties instead of the state, and spread a culture of marginalization to encourage the parties to enter into wars with the center to extract their rights by force and establish independent mini-states. The goal of establishing the Republic of South Sudan is a first step to establishing the state of Kush, which will bring together the independent states of ancient Sudan. Work will be done to repeat the same scenario that led to the separation of the south, which is war, then peace, then self-determination, then separation and formation of independent mini-states, then uniting in a subsequent step to establish the state of Kush (Al-Ardi, 2012). As for northern Sudan, it will be occupied by the second separation, which is the separation of Darfur. Sudan will be divided into three countries: the south, the Islamic state of the north, and the state of Darfur, which will be added to the League of Arab States (Figure 2). This fragmentation plan is considered public and not secret, and it is the new (Sykes-Picot), with the exception of Israel, the only beneficiary of the division of the Arab countries, as it was at the beginning of the Kingdom of Egypt and Sudan, then the states of Egypt and Sudan, and now the establishment of three mini-states in Sudan (Al-Raddadi, 2010).



Figure 2: Partition of Sudan into five states according to the Israeli-American Plan

### The United States of America's plan to divide Sudan

The United States is considered the main force behind the South Sudan separatist movement and its goals are to tear Sudan apart by applying a divide-and-rule strategy to delay the renaissance of Africa, at the same time it works to pave the way for American companies to encroach on Sudanese petroleum resources (Main, 2011). The American role in settling the conflict in South Sudan has begun since 1972, Washington, with the support of the World Council of Churches, succeeded in reaching the Addis Ababa Agreement. The same scenario was repeated through American sponsorship of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement in 2005, where the SPLM worked to exploit religious and ethnic factors in its war against the North (Al-Bawaba, 2011).

There are hidden dimensions to the issue of South Sudan, including the general confrontation between the center and the periphery in a state characterized by total inequality in power and resources, and the intense conflict over diminishing resources among ethnic groups in different parts of Sudan (Kok, 1996). In confirmation of this, it became clear that the famine that occurred among the Dinka in the period 1985-88 was rooted in the exploitation of northern Sudanese traders due to the policies of the central government, in addition to international interests, as international donors found a “space for action” that enabled them to use policies that were effective to a long extent (Keen, 1991). This may be within the status of social care for Negroes and one of the forms of philanthropic colonialism that had two faces, one of which was the face of paternalism based on the assumption of their cultural and clinical backwardness, based on the assumption that they are exposed to psychological destruction related to their history as Negroes (Miller, 1969). Here, non-governmental organizations, even in the absence of democracy and under a harsh authoritarian government, can intervene positively and contribute to socio-economic change, especially those affecting the marginalized poor, by highlighting issues that concern them and working to promote alternatives to political Islam.

Dividing the Arab world into mini-states is still a dream on the American administration's agenda (Juwayda, 2011). The United States sees the need to re-divide the Middle East, including Sudan, into small, weak states, where the Arab Spring revolutions began, as former US intelligence chief James Woolsey said in 2006, "We will create for them an Islam that suits us, then we will make them carry out revolutions, and they will be divided among each other into fanatic strife, and then we will come marching." We will be victorious (Al-Makki, 2014). In a message broadcast by the Israeli intelligence website "Debka" quoting African intelligence sources, the American and Israeli intelligence services are currently working to dismantle the authority in Khartoum through internal agents and rebel movements, after which five confederal states will be established, including the Islamic State of Sudan, the State of Darfur, a state in the south, the State of the Nuba Mountains, and the State of the Blue Nile (Figure 2). They established two main centers to launch their plans, the first operating in Chad and the second based in Djibouti (Al-Sayed, 2013).

The emergence of the conflict in Darfur may indicate that the civil war in Sudan was not, in its entirety, a conflict between North and South or between Muslims and Christians, but rather it was a conflict at the country level that included even Muslim groups. The two main anti-government groups are the Justice and Equity Movement and the Sudanese Liberation Movement/Army. It is said that the Janjaweed are of Chadian origins finance themselves through plunder and pillage and receive veiled support from the government in Khartoum (Mans, 2004).

The United States of America seeks to establish an independent state in central and northern Sudan that will be under American administration and with Egyptian approval, as an Egyptian-American understanding occurred regarding the future of the region. The American plan aims to divide Sudan into five countries (Al-Muslim website, 1426 AH). The US Congress unanimously approved in a secret session in 1983 the Dr. Bernard Lewis project, and thus the project became a top American policy so they made long-term plans for it (Al-Tanaib, 2019). The project aims to divide the Arab world in favor of the Zionist state where "These peoples must be tightened, besieged, and ethnic contradictions, tribal and sectarian fanaticism must be exploited in them before they invade America and Europe to destroy civilization there" (Abdel Fatah, 2018).

Bernard Lewis's document to fragment the Arab and Islamic world believes that it is necessary to re-divide the Arab and Islamic countries into tribal and sectarian units (Ben Jeddou, 2020). Regarding Sudan, Bernard Lewis says, "Sudan is the most disintegrated country in the Arab and Islamic world, as it consists of four population groups, each of which is alien to the other. Therefore, it can be divided into four states as well: the Nubia state, which is integrated with the Nubia state in Egyptian territory, the Islamic northern state, with its capital, Khartoum, and the Christian South state, whose capital will be Juba, and the Darfur state, whose capital will be El Fasher" (Haider, 2019) (Figure 3).

The United States seeks to benefit from the intensity of the conflict in Darfur, in which several factors have combined in recent years, including local factors, including drought, desertification, and high population growth. The emerging crisis between the central authority and the worsening political crisis in the Darfur region in light of the deterioration of local governance there also helped. American policy benefits from these conditions and strives to grant independence to the Darfur region (Al-Muslim website, 1426 AH). As it is rich in uranium, gold, and petroleum (Abdel Baqi, 2018). International oil companies are waiting for Darfur to secede from Sudan so that they can achieve the greatest possible gains. Therefore, the theory of creative chaos has been operating in Darfur since 2003, alongside an international game whose chapters have not yet been completed around the oil triangle located in the common area between western Sudan - Darfur in particular - Chad and Libya, which is essentially a French-American-Chinese conflict.



Figure 3: Bernard Lewis' map to divide Sudan

The American strategy regarding Sudan will continue without change because the Americans believe that it is the weakest link, achieving an African breakthrough in Darfur may be recorded as a bright spot that serves American strategic interests aimed at reducing historical French influence, especially after oil discoveries and the imminent depletion of natural resources facing all over the world (Al-Hajj, 2012). Political-economic globalization benefits from the sanctions or blockade imposed by the United Nations on countries as a weapon with increasing military use in the politics of the international community, assuming that they are effective means of forcing “rogue” transgressor countries to return to the international line. Although these sanctions forced these countries, including Sudan, to remain within the international legal framework, they worked to strengthen them internally, which increased social divisions and armed action of a religious nature. Contrary to what was intended, the sanctions have destroyed long-term aspirations for political stability and good governance in the Middle East and have not created a secure global order. Sudan's fate is considered inevitable, vital, and critical to political stability in the Northeast African and Red Sea region.

---

## Discussion

The conditions of political instability in Sudan created appropriate opportunities for global imperialism and its new approach known as political-economic globalization to develop plans for its division. The circumstances of Sudan's political instability are due to its failure to achieve political governance that satisfies its disparate ethnic and political components, in addition to the lack of a clear foreign policy for most of the period of independence, but rather irregular interests in the affairs of the outside world, in addition to its developmental and ethnic problems that have been rooted since its formation as a state during the period of British rule. Under the policies of global imperialism and its arm known as globalization, Sudan has become under the hammer of division into mini-states that exploit its natural and human resources in accordance with the policies of colonial governments. The new generation of these colonial governments was built through contemporary investment agreements (Mann, 2003), which were opposed by the New Bandung framework agreement based on a stable North-South regime. Reigning orthodoxies have seized land and agricultural investments in Africa via Asian states. This bears the characteristic of core-centric models such as accumulation by scarcity or dispossession, which failed to stop the collapse of accumulation strategies in the northern countries because of their connection to the new forces, policies, and movements in the southern countries. Asian investments represent an attempt to meet the rising food demands of the new elite in emerging economies, and class cooperation between them and the African elite, rather than a crisis of accumulation (Martin, et al., 2014).

The countries of the North, within the system of modern imperialism, have increasingly participated in the process of horizontal domination and sovereignty in their quest for access to natural resources by virtue of the growth of the global economy which has become more integrated. They have projected their combined power onto the countries of the Global South to assert vertical control in the ongoing sharing and withdrawal of resources. This domination and control gave rise to a cruciform global structure, where the resulting uneven development was associated with poverty, competition for resources, and conflict (Carmody, 2009).

These imperialist policies were followed by widespread aggression and seizure of lands around the world by international institutions, especially on the African continent, since the emergence of the global financial crisis in 2008 AD, and the associated food crisis. Between 2010-2011, an estimated 227 million hectares in the Third World, equivalent to the area of northern and western Europe, were sold, licensed, or leased to foreign institutions. In 2009 alone, 50 million hectares of farmers were transferred to these institutions. Some of this land was purchased, while the vast majority was leased over a long period of time, ranging from 25 to 99 years, which usually had to be renewed (Broughton, 2012). These activities cause the problem of climate change in the rich industrial countries of Europe and America, which are able to adapt to climate change while poor countries are unable to do so. (Bachram, 2004) The practices of large multinational companies and institutions that have interests in cocoa production and are supported by organizations that provide It itself works to achieve fair trade, as a means of reproducing and continuing the slavery of workers around the world. This exploitation is clearly concentrated among the people of the country of Ivory Coast, which produces 40% of global cocoa production (Athreya, 2011).

For many decades, Sudan has been coveted by many foreign powers that want to control and dominate its capabilities, or at least obtain them at the lowest prices, as they are eager to benefit from the country's natural resources and strategic location. The UAE is considered the largest export destination in Sudan, followed by China. Sudan has agreed to lease millions of acres to Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Turkey, and China, and the coastline on the Red Sea is an important sea route (Arabi Post, 2020). In its relentless pursuit of energy sources, China has established relationships with pariah states that the United States seeks to marginalize, which has led to creating tensions with the new Chinese policy (Canning, 2007). Chinese national petroleum companies have become new players in the global petroleum industry in the past two decades. Since it lacks sufficient experience in competing with other international companies in managing huge oil fields, with little experience in political risks and security, it has gained from its experience in Sudan a competitive role in global strategy and in developing its capabilities (Patey, 2017).

George Bush conducted a dialogue with Khartoum, followed by a constructive policy between the two parties, in contrast to Clinton's policy aimed at isolating Sudan. This is due to the influence of the American Church, the importance of combating terrorism, and economic interests, especially the pressure group or the oil lobby (Huliaras, 2006). The efforts made by American activists to pressure Asian companies in Sudan are similar to those efforts to find light in the darkness or swim against the current. While the campaign of plunder and dispossession against Sudan is increasing in the United States, its impact on achieving real results in Sudan remains questionable. These activists failed to integrate Sudan's broad economic and political relations into their various strategies, but they did, arguably, look for ways to put pressure on state-owned enterprises by divestment of the financial market (Patey, 2009).

One of the factors that helped provide a basis for globalization to operate is the developments that occurred in Sudan during the last three decades, which led to a gradual and regular change in the nature of the conflict from the traditional form of an ethnic-religious nature to one over resources. The role of

resources increased with the worsening of the economic crisis, as they emerged as an influential force in the civil war in Sudan (Suliman, 1977). This is considered part of the framework of the dialogue on the relationship of oil to development in Africa, as some believe that oil wealth fuels corruption in the state and creates social crises. violent civil conflict, extravagance, and waste. Sudan found increased global interest when it became an exporter of oil, and more attention focused on oil as a source of wealth and power and as a subject of potential conflict. In reality, oil alone will not lead to violence and corruption, as conflict only occurs as a result of the "politicization" of the oil factor in ways that make control over it and its distribution confined to the hands of a few who work to make it exclusive to others (Obi, 2007).

Local conflicts overlap with national and regional conflicts, as issues related to land, play a role in creating poverty and driving and sustaining ongoing conflicts driven by an agenda that works from the top down and the bottom up (Sorbo, 2010). In the issue of South Sudan, there are concealed dimensions that include the general confrontation between the center and the margins in a state characterized by total inequality in power and resources, and the intense conflict over diminishing resources among ethnic groups in different parts of Sudan (Kok, 1996). It became clear that the famine that occurred among the Dinka in the period 1985-88 was rooted in the exploitation of northern Sudanese traders due to the policies of the central government as well as international interests, as international donors found "room to operate" that enabled them to use policies that were effective to a long extent (Keen, 1991).

Sudan has emerged as a cornerstone of developing economies, linking the oil-rich Arab countries to the rest of sub-Saharan Africa, making it vulnerable to modern imperialist ambitions. It has received significant grants and loans from Arab countries to increase its agricultural productivity so that it becomes a food basket for the Arab world and to achieve regional food security so that it can avoid any economic boycott imposed on it by the Western world in the future. Until recently, Sudan was not an expected element linking the desires and interests of Arabs and sub-Saharan Africa. The African continent and the Middle East region have gone through experience of separatist movements carried out by local nationalities in the past decades, often supported by external interests and concerns to achieve their political or economic imperialist goals. In this context, the forces of the left and right struggled to decide the national issue in South Sudan.

Seven years after the government of Jaafar al-Nimeiry, which achieved some success during the first two years, the government drifted towards programs dependent on Western aid and investment, which was accompanied by violent suppression of the Sudanese military and organized unions and the Sudanese Communist Party in 1971 AD. This repression reflects the conflict between Numeiri's government and the Sudanese popular forces over which social classes should lead the struggle for social change. This led to the strong alliance between Sadat's Egypt and the rich oil-producing Arab countries as partners in Sudan's economic development. These countries see Sudan as a showcase for agri-business in the Middle East. Whatever the promise of such development trends, they represent the most important economic and political changes in Sudan since the entry of British colonialism at the end of the nineteenth century (Collins, 1976).

Sudanese politics has become complex since the 1964 revolution as a result of many intertwined and often contradictory factors. Although Sudan is located along a belt of partly Christian and partly Muslim countries, however, it did not find acceptance or love from the Christian governments in power in those neighboring countries at a time when Sudan had the ability to be a confrontation state between the revolutionary Arabs and the governments that had an orientation towards the Eastern camp and the governments that had an orientation towards the West. The government of General Abboud from 1958-1964 officially stood for world peace, African unity, Arab unity, non-neutrality, and the struggle of peoples for freedom. But through practice, it became clear that the military government was indifferent to foreign policy at a time when most African countries had determined their position towards the Western or Eastern blocs and Sudan remained far from them. President Abboud's meeting with US President Kennedy in 1961 encouraged good relations between the two countries, but Shawan-Lai's visit to Sudan in January 1974 did not mean much in foreign policy frameworks. It is natural for the military to seek recognition and assistance from powerful countries in order to strengthen their positions. African problems remained present in both national and regional considerations despite the end of the Cold War and the disappearance of external strategic and ideological considerations. Sudanese-American relations developed after the year 2000, although they were characterized by hostility and ferocity before that, especially after the events of September 11. In fact, it is impossible to understand the necessity of continued bilateral cooperation and mutual dependence in achieving internal peace in Sudan and ending the war on terrorism.

---

## Conclusion

This research reviewed some plans that aim to divide Sudan into several states for the purpose of benefiting from its numerous and abundant natural resources. All of these plans do not deviate from the trends of global imperialism and modern globalization in controlling resources, especially in countries that suffer from ethnic conflicts and carry the seeds of fragmentation, including Sudan. During its rule of Sudan, British colonialism worked to establish the geographical borders of Sudan, with which it was known as a globally recognized state. However, it laid the foundations for the future division of Sudan by implementing the policy of closed areas in southern Sudan, the Nuba Mountains, the Angasna region, and partly some areas of western Sudan. The implementation of this policy was followed by the cultural isolation of these areas from the rest of Sudan, where isolated nationalities were eventually formed paving the way for the creation of armed movements and separation from the rest of Sudan. Accordingly, Israel and the United States began to help it achieve these demands but even went beyond making proposals to divide Sudan into many states. The globalization environment and international ambitions for Sudan's resources have helped strengthen partition plans in addition to Sudan's fragile internal conditions.

Preserving Sudan as a state with its own political entity requires the existence of a political system capable of thwarting all these plans. This requires the formulation of a social contract acceptable to all of Sudan's ethnic, cultural, and political components to establish this political system.



---

**References**


---

- Abdel Fattah A. December 21, 2018. Bernard Lewis's plan to divide Sudan and Egypt. Al-Rakouba electronic newspaper. (Arabic)
- Africa News Portal. October 26, 2015. Books - Loud surprises about the role of Israeli intelligence in dividing Sudan. [africangatenews.net](http://africangatenews.net) (Arabic)
- Al-Ardi, F. Al-Sharq newspaper. January 2, 2012. A political source for Al-Sharq newspaper: A plan to break up Sudan and establish a "Kush" state. <https://m.alsharq.net.sa> (Arabic)
- Alawiya Dictionary of Shamar. May 21, 2013. Facebook? (Arabic)
- Al-Bawaba January 2011. America sponsors the division of Sudan and Israel expands its influence. [www.albawaba.com](http://www.albawaba.com) (Arabic)
- Albdel-Alatif, A. B. 1996. The religious dimension of the South Sudan issue. Center for Strategic Studies, Khartoum, p. 31. (Arabic)
- Ali, B. 2010. Repression of Sudanese civil society under the National Islamic Front/National Congress Party. *Review of African political economy* 37 (126): 437-450.
- Al-Makki. A.H.O. 2014. Within three years, the map of Sudan will change. Akher Lazha newspaper. Al-Nilin website. (Arabic)
- Al-Raddadi, Ayed. 2010. What happens after dividing Sudan into three states? Madina.com
- Al-Sahli, Nabil. 9/19/2008. Presentation of the book: Sudan and the Future of Geopolitical Conflict, by Abu Iskandar Al-Sudani - Publisher, Al-Ghad Al-Arabi Center for Studies - Damascus - First Edition 2008. Al-Jazeera [www.aljazeera.net](http://www.aljazeera.net)
- Al-Tanaib, Jassim. 9/26/2019. Bernard Lewis. The Godfather of Partition 2-2. Al-Anbaa [www.alanba.com.kw](http://www.alanba.com.kw) (Arabic)
- Athreya, B. 2011. White Man's "Burden" and the new colonialism in West African cocoa production. *Race/Ethnicity Multidisciplinary Global Contexts* 5 (1):51-59.
- Babiker, Saif Al-Din. 10/03/2018. Sudan today has been in a conflict between the Egyptian Arab movement and the Afro-Fulani movement since 1956. Who will win? Sudanese-Online. <https://sudaneseonline.com> (Arabic)
- Bachram, H. 2004. Climate fraud and carbon colonization: the new trade-in greenhouse gases. *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 15 (4):5-20.
- Ben Jeddou, N. 4/27/2020. In the footsteps of the division of Sudan...announcing a "state" in southern Yemen. Al-Shorouk website. [www.shorouk.com](http://www.shorouk.com) (Arabic)
- Broughton, A. 2012. Land grabbing: A new colonialism. *International journal of socialist renewal*. Links.org.au
- Canning, C. 2007. Pursuit of the pariah: Iran, Sudan, and Myanmar in China's energy security strategy. *Security Challenges* 3 (1):47-63.
- Carmody, P. 2009. Cruciform sovereignty, matrix governance and the scramble for Africa's oil: Insights from Chad and Sudan. *Political Geography* 28 (6): 353-361.
- Cohen, B.J. 2018. *The geography of money*, Cornell University Press.
- Collins, C. 1976. Colonialism and Class Struggle in Sudan. *MERIP Reports* 46: 3-17+20.
- Cordesman, A.H. 2019. *The Gulf and search for strategic stability: Saudi Arabia, the military balance in the Gulf, and trends in the Arab- Israeli military balance*. Routledge
- Dirar, Abdul Rahim. February 21, 2020. Sudan and the grand conspiracy: normalization with Israel and division into mini-states... when and how? Al Sharq al-sharq.com (Arabic)
- El Shair, I.M. 2015. Ethnic groups and the emergence of South Sudan: A study in socio-political geography. *J. of social affairs* 52 (2454):1-26.
- Gidron, Y. 1971. "One People, One Struggle": Anya-Nya propaganda and the Israeli Mossad in Southern Sudan, 1969-1971. *Journal of Eastern African Studies* 12 (3):428-453.
- Haider, Alaa. April 14, 2019. The Muslim Brotherhood and the division of Sudan Country. *Ballad news*. (Arabic)
- Hajj, our exile. April 29, 2012. *The Plot to Divide Sudan*, written by Al-Fatih Kamel, Arab House of Sciences, Publishers. Al Bayan newspaper [www.albayan.ae](http://www.albayan.ae) (Arabic)
- Hamdan, Ezz El-Din. Sudan is part of the largest American division project for the Arab and Islamic world: the Bernard Lewis Project (1). Al Rakouba newspaper. (Arabic)
- Harris, C.1991. Power, modernity, and historical geography. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 81 (4): 671-683.
- Hassan, Y. F. 1967. The Sudanese revolution of October 1964. *The journal of modern African studies* 5 (4):491-509.
- Howell, J., Hamid, B.M.1969. Sudan and the Outside World, 1964-1968. *African Affairs* 68 (273): 299-315.

- Huliaras, A. 2006. Evangelists, oil companies, and terrorists: The Bush administration's policy towards Sudan. *Orbis* 50 (4):709-724.
- Juwaida, F. January 7, 2011. Arab silence and the conspiracy to divide Sudan. Islam Today website, quoted from the Egyptian Al-Shorouk newspaper, [www.islamstory.com](http://www.islamstory.com) (Arabic)
- Karadawi, A. 1991. The smuggling of the Ethiopian Flasha to Israel through Sudan. *African Affairs* 90 (358):23-49.
- Keen, D. 1991. A disaster for whom? Local interests and international donors during famine among the Dika of Sudan. *Disasters* 15 (2): 150-165.
- Kok, P. 1996. Sudan: Between radical restructuring and deconstruction of State systems. *Review of African political economy* 23 (70):555-562.
- Luke, A P. 2009. Against the Asian tide: the Sudan divestment campaign. *The journal of modern African studies* 47 (4): 551-573.
- Luke, P. 2017. Learning in Africa: China's overseas oil investments in Sudan and South Sudan. *Journal of Contemporary China* 26 (107): 756-768.
- Machar, R.T.D. 1995. "South Sudan: A History of Political Domination - A Case of Self-Determination". Ben.Parker@dha.sasa.unep.no (Ben Parker)  
Subject: document Message-Id: c51\_9511191041@sasa.unep.no
- Mahmoud, F.B. 1983. *The Sudanese Bourgeoisie: vanguard of development*. Zed Press, London.
- Main, Y. 2011. Oil factors behind Southern Sudan referendum and implications to Chinese oil investment in Sudan. *Sino-Global Energy* 5.cnki.net
- Mann, H. 2003. International investment agreements: Building the new colonialism. *Proceedings of the ASIL annual meeting* 97:247-250.
- Mans, U. 2004. Briefing: Sudan: the new war in Darfur. *Africa Affairs* 103 (411): 291-294.
- Martin, W.G., Palat, R. A. 2014. Asian land acquisition in Africa: Beyond the "new building" or" new colonialism"? *Agrarian South: Journal of political economy* 3 (1):125-150.
- Miller, H. 1969. Social work in the black ghetto: The new colonialism. *Social work* 14 (3):65-76.
- Fathia Musa. 2013. Dividing Sudan into "five" states... Restructuring the state through agents. *Al-Intibaha Journalism* 05/25/2013. (Arabic)
- Muslim website. 2 Rabi' al-Thani 1426 AH. Dividing Sudan between the malice of the outside and the negligence of the inside. Muslim website [almoslim.net](http://almoslim.net) (Arabic)
- Muttlak, H.K., Mohi Aldeen, R.D. 2019. The geographic importance of Sudan in the Israeli strategic perception. *Tikrit Journal of Political Sciences*, 528-557.
- Nmoma, V. 2006. The shift in United States-Sudan relations: A troubled relationship and the need for mutual cooperation. *Journal of Conflict Studies* 26 (2). <https://journals.lib.unb.ca>
- Obi, C. 2007. Oil and development in Africa: Some lessons from the oil factor in Nigeria for the Sudan. *Oil development in Africa: Lessons for Sudan after the comprehensive peace agreement*, Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Studies Report 8.
- Oded, A. 2006. Israeli-Ugandan relations in the time of Id Amin. *Jewish political studies review* 18(3/4): 65-79.
- Rose-Rewood, R. S. 2006. Governmentality, geography, and the geo-coded world. *Progress in Human Geography* 30 (4):469-486.
- Sassen, S. 2000. The state and the new geography of power. *The ends of globalization: Bringing society back in*, 49-65
- Sorbo, G.M. 2010. Local violence and international intervention in Sudan. *Review of African Political Economy* 37 (124):173-186.
- Spaulding, J. 2000. The chronology of Sudanese Arabic genealogical tradition. *History of Africa* 27:325-337.
- Suliman, M. 1977. Civil war in Sudan: The impact of ecological degradation. *Contributions in Black Studies* 15 (1),7. <https://scholarworks.umass.edu>.
- Turner, M.E. 1990. Achebe, Hegel, and the new colonialism. *Kunapipi* 12 (2), 6. [Ro.uow.au](http://Ro.uow.au)
- Wai, D.M. 1979. The Sudan: domestic politics and foreign relations under Nimiery. *African Affairs* 78 (312):297-317.
- Woodward, P. 1979. *Condominium and Sudanese nationalism*. Collins, London. [Africabib.org](http://Africabib.org)
- Yahya, Ahmed Muhammad. 2009. The development of Sudanese-Iranian relations between the period 1974-2009. [Google.com](http://Google.com) (Arabic)
- Yahya, O. 2015. The international conflict over the Horn of Africa and its impact on the security of the Arabian Gulf. *African journal of political sciences* 4 (1)
- Young, A. 2018. *Transforming Sudan*. Cambridge University Press.