

Ottawa  
Tuesday, December-02-14

## **Article 60 on South Sudan**

### **Developments in South Sudan Conflict: On UN taking South Sudan under Trusteeship**

Our Articles 1 to 59 were situation analyses of the conflict in South Sudan. Our articles 4 (A), 4 (B) and 4 (C) were the first of our series on “Who is Who”. This article 60 deals with the issue of the UN preparing to take South Sudan under trusteeship.

#### **Categorical denial by the UNSG**

The following is a near-verbatim transcript of today’s noon briefing by Stéphane Dujarric, Spokesman for the Secretary-General (Dec 1<sup>st</sup> 2014)

Quote

#### **\*\*South Sudan**

A couple of answers to questions we have been asked over the weekend. On South Sudan and rumours as reported in South Sudanese and other regional media alleging that the United Nations has a plan to place the Republic of South Sudan under a "protectorate": I can tell you that these reports are completely false and not true. The Secretary-General wishes to make it categorically clear that neither he nor the UN Mission in South Sudan, UNMISS, is aware of any plans or discussions within the United Nations to take such course of action. The UN has supported the cause of self-determination for South Sudan from the time of the 2005 Comprehensive Peace Agreement through to the 2011 referendum and independence. None of this would have been possible without the help of the United Nations.

Unquote

You can find the exact text and other issues in the link:  
<http://www.un.org/press/en/2014/db141201.doc.htm>

#### **That was our position all the time:**

To the same question as part of the 20 questions circulated last week by the SPLM/A-IO for Global Polling, we replied:

Quote

A4: This is not correct. The UN is not “preparing”. Some of the members in the UNSC are drafting a proposal for a resolution. This is a very early stage. Taking a country under UN receivership is not a joke and no one in his right mind will do it. It is a very expensive undertaking and South Sudan is not IRAQ, Kosovo, Bosnia or Afghanistan. This, in essence, will be “State Building” similar to Japan and Germany after WWII. It will need a “Marshal Plan”. Is

anyone willing to do such a plan for South Sudan with 10.6 million people and 350,000 BPD of oil maximum output?

Unquote

**Comment:**

We all need to be concentrating on firming up and professionalizing the IGAD Political Settlement Process. There does not seem to be another regional or international window now. No one wants to come near such a messy file.

With Pagak still not started (December 2<sup>nd</sup> 2014) and needing at least one week to deliberate and one week to process data, with Juba building a huge concrete wall with its hurriedly assembled consultations and its manipulated outputs of the conference, we have a case impossible for Addis talks Session VIII. Massive back-tacking has taken place.

With IGAD Envoys giving the Opposition “Carte Blanche” not to restart the talks until Pagak is done (and in writing), the talks may not start until after the New Year 2015. Did IGAD say Nov 20<sup>th</sup> when they adjourned? Or are we wrong!! We are 12 days past the date and not ONE word from IGAD.

We expect Pagak to come out with no less radical positions than Juba. Even those who may have had thoughts of compromise and dealing with realities of life in the consultations in Pagak, will now be upset with Juba’s U-turns and entrenchment attitudes or trapped by the angry.

More in our next article # 61 with Juba preparing for war and the need for another approach and theme to get a break-through other than power-sharing.

Subsahara Centre  
Ottawa  
Canada