

Re: Genocide

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2007-02/msg00710.html>

- *From:* "columbiaaccidentinvestigation" <columbiaaccidentinvestigation@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 18 Feb 2007 22:11:34 -0800
-

On Feb 18, 6:47 am, "columbiaaccidentinvestigation" <columbiaaccidentinvestigation@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Jan 31, 5:26 pm, Pat Flannery <flan@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

columbiaaccidentinvestigation wrote:

But it is your choice to lower usenet to your standards of belligerence and disregard for civil discussion, or can you act like a responsible adult and just try yourself to find a solution to the Darfur issue,

I'm not going to do a damn thing about the Darfur issue, anymore than I'd expect the inhabitants of Darfur to suddenly get hard at work to solve North Dakota's flagging rural economy issue. Let Africa solve Africa's problems.

Pat

Here is a link to the Darfur Peace Accountability Act (DPAA), an executive order E.O. signed by president bush October 13, 2006 prohibiting U.S. persons from engaging transactions with the government of Sudan, but allowing trade and humanitarian assistance to take place in specified areas "including Southern Sudan, Southern Kordofan/Nuba Mountains State, Blue Nile State, Abyei, Darfur, and marginalized areas in and around Khartoum"

tom

(the page only loads in html only, but it contains a ton of info)<http://www.ustreas.gov/offices/enforcement/ofac/rss/ofac.xml>
"The President signed the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act"

Re: Genocide

("DPAA"), into law on October 13, 2006. In order to take appropriate account of the relevant provisions in the DPAA, and to continue the Administration's pursuit of sanctions against Sudan, the President issued an Executive Order, "Blocking Property Of And Prohibiting Transactions With The Government Of Sudan" on October 13, 2006 (the "E.O."). The E.O. blocks all property and interests in property of the Government of Sudan that are in the United States, that come within the United States, or that are or come within the possession or control of U.S. persons, including their overseas branches, and prohibits U.S. persons from engaging in any transactions involving such property or interests in property. It also prohibits all transactions by U.S. persons relating to Sudan's petroleum or petrochemical industries, including, but not limited to, oilfield services and oil or gas pipelines. The current sanctions will no longer prohibit trade and related transactions or humanitarian assistance in the areas of Sudan specified in the DPAA, including Southern Sudan, Southern Kordofan/Nuba Mountains State, Blue Nile State, Abyei, Darfur, and marginalized areas in and around Khartoum, provided that the Government of Sudan does not have any property interest in the transaction. In addition, the new Order preserves a full trade ban on the areas of Sudan not specified in the DPAA..."

Essentially one of the main investors in Sudanese oil production is the Chinese government through the state owned China National Petroleum Corporation (CNPC) and its subsidiaries. The Chinese government through the CNPC is attempting to meet the demand of electricity for a growing population by investing in large petroleum production projects in Africa, specifically Sudan. Here is a link to U.N. Resolution 1706, which authorized the use of "all necessary means to protect U.N. personnel during implementation of the Darfur peace agreement. (China, Qatar, and the Russian federation abstained from the vote).

tom

Council on Foreign Relations

http://www.cfr.org/publication/9557/china_africa_and_oil.html

"China, Africa, and Oil

Esther Pan

Updated: January 26, 2007

Introduction

As global demand for energy continues to rise, major players like the United States, European Union (EU), and Japan are facing a new competitor in the race to secure long-term energy supplies: China. With its 2006 GDP growth hitting 10.7 percent, China is intent on getting the resources needed to sustain its soaring economy, and is taking its quest to lock down sources of oil and other necessary raw materials across the globe. With the Middle East mired in long-term instability, China has turned toward another major oil producing region whose risks and challenges have caused it to be overlooked by much of the rest of the world: Africa."

Re: Genocide

UN Resolution 1706

<http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2006/sc8821.doc.htm>

"Security Council 31 August 2006

Department of Public Information · News and Media Division · New York

SC/8821 Security Council

5519th Meeting (AM)

Security Council expands mandate of un mission in sudan to include darfur,

adopting resolution 1706 by vote OF 12 IN favour, with 3 abstaining

Invites Consent of Sudanese Government; Authorizes Use of 'All

Necessary Means'

To Protect United Nations Personnel, Civilians under Threat of

Physical Violence

The Security Council decided this morning to expand the mandate of the

United Nations Mission in the Sudan (UNMIS) to include its deployment

to Darfur, without prejudice to its existing mandate and operations,

in order to support the early and effective implementation of the

Darfur Peace Agreement.

As it adopted resolution 1706 (2006) by a vote of 12 in favour with 3

abstentions (China, Qatar, Russian Federation), the Council invited

the consent of the Sudanese Government of National Unity for that

deployment, and called on Member States to ensure an expeditious

deployment. It requested the Secretary-General to arrange the rapid

deployment of additional capabilities to enable UNMIS to deploy in

Darfur....

WANG GUANGYA (China) said that the African Union, at the request of

the Sudanese Government, had put in enormous efforts to help stabilize

the situation in Darfur. China had all along highly commended and

supported its endeavour. According to the African Union decision,

after consulting and upon agreement by the Government of National

Unity, the United Nations would take over AMIS function of carrying

out the mission in the region. China was in favour of replacing AMIS

with a United Nations operation. That was a good idea and a realistic

option, and it would help to improve the situation on the ground,

-serving the interests of all parties. He, therefore, supported, with

the consent of the Government of National Unity, the deployment of

United Nations troops in Darfur as soon as feasible. He also agreed

that the Security Council needed to make the necessary decision at an

early date, so as to effectively fulfil the responsibilities set forth

in the Charter and assist the Government of National Unity in

achieving comprehensive and lasting peace and stability in Darfur.

The Darfur Peace Agreement had instilled new dynamics and offered new

opportunities for resolving the Darfur issue, he said. Unfortunately,

it had failed to yield peace so far. What was more alarming was that

the security situation had deteriorated further, and AMIS was

confronted with enormous difficulties. To ease the situation on the

ground and difficulties faced by AMIS, the Secretary-General had put

Re: Genocide

forward some good recommendations, and the League of Arab States had also expressed a willingness to finance AMIS. The Council should attach great importance to that, give full play to the initiatives of various regional organizations, help AMIS overcome its difficulties so it would be able to continue the peacekeeping mission and ease tension in Darfur in a timely and effective manner.

To address the crisis, it was necessary to bear in mind both the sense of urgency and the sober assessment of the complexity of the situation, he continued. It was also necessary to demonstrate both firm determination and corresponding patience, as well as an effective approach. A transition to a United Nations mission was a good and pragmatic option, but the mission could only be deployed when the consent of the Government was obtained. That was the understanding and decision of the African Union and the Security Council, respectively. In order to clear doubts and deepen mutual understanding, the Secretary-General had proposed holding a direct high-level dialogue at the Council among the parties involved. While it was hopeful to conduct such dialogue in early September, his delegation deemed it necessary for the Council to put the draft to the vote in a hurry, to help create a good atmosphere among the stakeholders and a conducive environment for smooth implementation of the resolution. Under the current circumstances, to push the adoption by the Council would not help stop further deterioration of the situation in Darfur. On the contrary, it could trigger further misunderstanding and confrontation.

He said that China accepted almost all the contents of the resolution, but it had consistently urged the co-sponsors to clearly put in "with the consent of the Government of National Unity" -- a fixed and standardized term on deploying United Nations missions. It had also urged the co-sponsors to carefully reconsider the timing of the vote. Regrettably, the co-sponsors had failed to earnestly heed China's sincere efforts. Under those circumstances, China had abstained in the vote."

.