

figure something out. You're telling us, that we are supposed to have sanctions against Sudan, because they're terrorists, but you can't name the terrorists. But when the President of Egypt tells you, that the British have the terrorists, and he names them, you can't put sanctions on London!? We can't understand that. What's the deal?" And that's how you do it. "We think maybe you're doing this to Sudan because it's a black country."

That's not really why—the real reason is, that they want to stop the Nile projects, the development projects. They don't want Sudan to be sovereign. But they also hate them because they're black. So, take advantage of the fact that the man is a racist. Back up the President of Egypt on his charges against the British, and you can *win* on Sudan.

That's how you have to fight. You don't have to have a gun; you don't need mercenaries going anywhere to kill anybody. What you need is some brains! Use your brain power, and you can succeed.

Discussion

What's really behind the attacks on Sudan?

Shahira Wahbi, the First Secretary of the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Sudan to the United Nations, made the following remarks to the conference:

Thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to address this august assembly.

I came to the United States two and a half years ago. And, here, I started to know things about my country that I didn't know before!

First of all, I learned that my country is a terrorist country. However, I have never seen a terrorist; I am not a terrorist. I have never heard of a terrorist act committed in Sudan by a Sudanese, actually. I think we learned in the university that there were eight terrorist acts in Sudan, which were committed by foreigners in Sudan. So, this is one of the first things that I learned.

The second thing I learned was, that my country is also a violator of human rights, which included that we are enslaving people, that we are killing Christians, that we are harassing women and flogging them. I also learned that we are discriminating against women, and recently I learned that we are starting to sexually abuse children.

The third thing I learned is, that my country is destabilizing its neighbors. And just looking at the map, I see that Sudan

has ten neighbors: Egypt in the north, Libya in the northwest, Chad in the west, Central African Republic on the southwest; we have the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Uganda, and Kenya, in the south, including all the old kingdoms of Africa. We have on the eastern side, Saudi Arabia across the Red Sea, Ethiopia, and newly, Eritrea. So, we were told that we were destabilizing our neighbors—all these ten countries.

However, I had conflicting signals. While I was told this, I find that my government is, with the government of Central African Republic and Chad, signing a trilateral agreement of cooperation and economic integration. So, I said, "Well, we are not destabilizing these. Maybe we are destabilizing others." Then, after a time, I find that these



I had the opportunity, along with several other state legislators, to go to Sudan in February of this year. And I was really surprised to have heard all these things they said were going on in Sudan, and to not see it there.

—State Rep. Harold James

joint ministerial committees, which take place between governments, are taking place between the government of Sudan and Ethiopia, and then, after some time in Saudi Arabia, then we find ministers coming and going to Egypt; then our President goes to Libya.

Then, it seems, that we are not destabilizing these people.

The factual thing, before my eyes, is that there is an ongoing relation, with the normal ups and downs, as between states everywhere in the world. So, I really started to look into U.S. documents (because I have access to them), to see what was the origin of these new-found facts about my country. I went back to resolutions passed on Sudan. I found that the outstanding resolutions on Sudan were about refugees. And the resolutions were perfect. You know, the UN language commending the government of Sudan for its hospitality, then requesting the international community to provide tangible assistance, and all these nice resolutions you have, when you are happy with a country.

And, up to 1989, the resolutions stop, and then we start

having what they call “omnibus resolutions,” where you group a lot of countries into one resolution. And, then, you drop some of them on the way. And then, suddenly, I find a resolution from 1994, on human rights violations in Sudan, which included all these things. So, I started to connect, that it seems that the political change in Sudan, which took place in 1989 through a coup d’état (as happens in many African countries—we should be really courageous enough to say that; it does happen, in Africa, all the time), came to power.

So, what happened next, was that this government finally said, “Well listen, we have had enough. We have a debt of \$13 billion. We do not want any assistance [from the International Monetary Fund]; we want to rely on ourselves. We do not want to have people giving us anything. We believe we have the resources. And, if we do not take, then we will be forced to work. We might succeed in some area, we might fail in others, but we will take this responsibility. So, then these things started to be implemented. When the government would enter into negotiations, they would not demand anything, they would just say, “Give us education, give us training for our people.”

And this was not really liked, because it might set an example for others.

So, this attitude had to be stopped. What was called for by many officials from many countries, was that the attitude of the government of Sudan has to change. This is the policy. So, actually, I was convinced that this attitude was not terrorism, because it is anti-Sudanese nature. I am a Sudanese. I think I know Sudanese. I cannot generalize (I know generalizations are bad, of course—there are exceptions in any society), but, we cannot generalize by saying that “Sudan is a terrorist country.” That means that *all* the Sudanese, including myself, are terrorists. So, I think this attitude, I came to believe was not due to terrorism, or human rights violations. Any of the accusations that I have learned of here, could not be, really, the real reason why my country is being attacked *every day*.

You know, I can’t imagine how, in five years, a country, with a magic wand, can suddenly be focussed upon. I am sure that ten years ago, nobody heard of Sudan. Everybody would say, “Oh, Sudan! South of Egypt where the pyramids are.” Full stop. But today, everybody knows Sudan as “where slavery is.”

This is the only question I have today: Why, in these last years, is my country under focus? Why is Sudan being attacked? And, certainly the international community must have realized all the so-called horrible things that were committed in Sudan before.

So, this is the question that I want each one of you to answer. You have a lot of intelligent people here, and I am sure that they would know the answer. Thank you.

Rep. Harold James replies

Pennsylvania State Rep. Harold James, on behalf the African Civil Rights Movement, took the opportunity to respond

to the question asked by the previous speaker. Mr. James is chairman of the Black Legislative Caucus for the state of Pennsylvania. In 1997, he had participated in a Schiller Institute-sponsored fact-finding mission to Sudan. The following are excerpts from his remarks:

I had the opportunity, along with several other state legislators, to go to Sudan in February of this year. And I was really surprised to have heard all these things they said were going on in Sudan, and to not see it there. In fact, I found that, when we were there, we had the opportunity to go where we wanted. When we wanted to be escorted by government officials, we were; and when we chose not to, we went walking



The forces that committed these crimes, these are the forces that we have to go after. These constitute the very enemy, as we have identified them, out of this conference here, as the British oligarchy, and British intelligence.

—Jacques Bacamurwanko

in town. We went to a mosque. On Sunday, we went to several Catholic churches. They were filled with people. Then, we went to a Coptic church. So, we saw freedom of religion there. . . .

We went into the south, into the Blue Nile state. We saw their agriculture, which was great. It just seemed to me, that this was a country that wanted to be independent . . . and what’s happening there, is what’s happening to a lot of us in the United States, and other countries.

It was appalling to be there, and to happen to look at a CNN program one night, and to see Baroness [Caroline] Cox [whose Christian Solidarity International is leading the wolf-pack against Sudan], and the CNN interviewer, talking about Khartoum getting ready to be overthrown. I was there in Khartoum, and I didn’t hear any noise, any shooting, anything. . . . And, they were talking about how bad it was—slavery and all that kind of thing. So, I called up the other people in the delegation and told them to look at CNN, and then I filmed it on my video camera, because I wanted to be able to show it at some point.

And, what was interesting is, they didn't have anybody from the Sudanese government to—and I always thought CNN was real fair, that if you were going to talk about a country, that you would have somebody from the current leadership, whether they agree or don't agree with you. But they didn't. They had somebody who was expelled from Sudan, and they had the Baroness Cox.

We met with the [Sudanese] Supreme Court. We met with five leaders from the south who had been fighting the government, who had now come together. They made a peace treaty this year, which I thought was excellent, where they got everybody except John Garang to sign. . . .

When Baroness Cox took two people from the *Baltimore Sun* over there, to try to prove that there was slavery, the guy who got them to buy a slave said, "Look, there's the slave's father right there. We've got to give him back." That was right after they had paid the money. And then, they tried to get him to give his name, and he said he wouldn't, because he said that if he would give his name, the government would lock him up.

So, that showed that the government was against it.

Only noble minds can transform the world

One of the highlights of the discussion at the conference, was the presentation given by Leni Rubinstein on the Eurasian Land-Bridge, and the ensuing discussion. Mr. Fang Neng Da, a poet, intellectual, and activist, spoke in response to a proposal from several Africans that, perhaps, the Eurasian Land-Bridge would offer a solution for Africa.

I have sat here very patiently from the beginning of this meeting, and listened very carefully. My name is Fang Neng Da—Fang is my family name—and I come from mainland China, and I have visited Hong Kong, Singapore, and Taiwan. I find that there is one common reason for us Chinese to stand together: that is, that we never disdain or discriminate against ourselves. We always respect ourselves. Even after the Opium War—at that time China was very weak, very poor, but we never thought, "We are of no value." Even very poor Chinese people still think they are valuable—not inferior to the rich white man, or to the colonialist.

Certainly, we differentiated those friendly Europeans, and Americans, from those not friendly. As for the British people, Sun Yat-sen had many British friends, even his teacher, who saved his life. *This* Britisher is not a bad one. But, those who launched the Opium War, it is obvious that they are bad people: no matter if they look like gentlemen, or how they dress or behave. So that, we recognize that we should unite with

the true friend, and keep a distance, and a vigilance, towards the enemy.

But also, we have an educational tradition, towards those enemies. We do not isolate ourselves. We make friends with them, but keep our principles to educate them, to turn them to become good men, to *transform* them. Even now, you see the Chinese government saying in the newspapers that "we should transform our ideology". . . . So, we should believe our *own* force, our *own* capability of using the mind to transform the world. First, we need to transform ourselves.

So, in Africa: Chinese have been in contact with Africa for a long time—since the Ming Dynasty. China sent big ships to Africa, much earlier than the European went to Africa. But China did not have the slightest intention to occupy and make aggression. . . . So, there must be a big difference.

You know why Sun Yat-sen is successful? He has a very noble mind. He never thought anything selfish. He donated all his energy, his life, he ventured all his assets to save China. That set a very good model. When the revolution breaks out, Sun Yat-sen is not in the country, he is abroad. But why did the people choose him to be President? Because, people knew, "He has a *noble mind*." Then, he *will* choose the best solution. If he does not have the best mind, even if he is very able, he may choose the wrong solution, and distort the original goal.

So, every one of us here should have a self-education, to devote ourselves unselfishly to mankind, including African people.

Binaisa: Africa is still enslaved by debt

One questioner from Nigeria asserted that the African Civil Rights Movement should prepare a "balance sheet" on the African debt, to which Dr. Godfrey Binaisa responded.

Q: A debtor does not look a creditor in the face, and say, "Hey, I can do what I want to do." Because right now, it is the creditor that has the upper hand, and the debtor has the lower hand. . . . I want the Schiller Institute to come up with a balance sheet for Africa, and actually itemize the debts of Africa to the IMF, to the World Bank, to the Group of Seven . . . and so on. Come up with a balance sheet, as to what, really, is the debt of Africa, and what are the assets of Africa. . . . I'm privy to the fact, that some Nigerians, coming together, can pay off a reasonable section of the African debts. . . .

Dr. Binaisa: I want to reply to my brother here, who asks about the debt. He wants the Schiller Institute to produce a balance sheet. I mean, that's all uncalled for, because we are