

Refuting the lies against Sudan

Abdel Mahmoud Al Koronky, press attaché at the Sudanese Embassy in London, addressed a Schiller Institute conference in Germany on Dec. 13.

It is an honor and a privilege to speak at this meeting. Many thanks to the Schiller Institute, which has made this gathering possible, and has brought people together for the sake of truth. And I swear before you, in every word I will say, I will say only the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

I will give you a briefing about my country, Sudan, which is a “minimized Africa.” It is the largest country in Africa, covering 1 million square miles, with different races, languages, cultures, and religions. We are surrounded by nine neighbors, and we are located literally in the heart of Africa.

In the latest report issued by the strategic institute in London, *The Military Balance in the World*, it says that 18 million people have been massacred, killed, since the end of the Second World War, and the absolute majority of these 18 million people are from Africa and Asia. It also says that the U.S.A. and Britain are number one and number two, as arms exporters. We in Sudan, as responsible human beings, are committed absolutely to stopping the civil war as soon as we can. We started by ourselves, and last April, we signed a peace treaty with seven rebel factions in Sudan. From now on, we share power and wealth, and, after four years, the southern Sudanese will vote in a referendum, monitored by everybody in the world, on whether to have a unified state or a separate state.

This treaty came as the result of a long process. We didn't stop talking about peace for nine successive years. And many of our former rebels and brothers joined us, and we started a new phase in our country. The international media, some organizations which are lobbied by hostile personalities or circles, are trying hard to play down the significance of this peace agreement. At the same time, they magnify the importance of the only faction left which has not signed the peace agreement: Mr. John Garang's faction, the SPLA. But, let me tell you, those who signed the peace agreement with the Sudan



government are the original founders of the rebel movement in the South, and they are the people who recruited John Garang. They recruited him, and one group of them are from his immediate tribal clan.

The peace process has now been put into a Presidential and Constitutional decree. The South now has 10 states out of 26; they have their parliaments, they have their state ministers, and the peace process in the South and throughout the country is getting increasingly a tremendous momentum, towards a new Sudan.

We tried hard in October to bring along the last faction, Mr. John Garang's faction, which has not signed the peace treaty. And to tell the truth, there are many, many people, friends of peace in the world, who participated in different stages and levels in our peace and well-being in Sudan. The last one of them is President Nelson Mandela, who invited President Omar al-Bashir, the President of Sudan, and Mr. John Garang to come together to Pretoria and to declare a cease-fire, and then to start serious peace talks and to finish the war once and for all. Mr. Bashir, for his part, responded positively to the invitation of Mr. Mandela, and declared immediately a unilateral cease-fire. But Mr. John Garang said he would not attend; he had some logistical reasons. So, an airplane was sent to Asmara, in Eritrea; they found him at last. He came to Pretoria, but left the country just before Mr. Bashir arrived.

In October, we had peace talks, which were supposed to be historic peace talks, in Nairobi, at the invitation of Kenyan President Daniel Arap Moi. And, when media reports started to come out saying that there was progress taking place in the talks in Nairobi, suddenly, on Nov. 4, Washington decided to impose economic sanctions against Sudan. At that moment, it meant a signal to the SPLA movement to put up new, even more stiff conditions. They never, in 15 years, had even mentioned them. And, they provided a new map to break up the country into two, laying claim to places, states, sources of wealth which have never been part of the historical South. And actually, this was against the IGAD initiatives—this is a summit of eight African Presidents in central and eastern Africa, which had issued a declaration of principles for ending the war. The eight Presidents said, the problem in Sudan is a

southern Sudan problem; it is not a problem of the whole country. The main partners in this dialogue are the Sudan government and the SPLA.

Then, when John Garang received the signal, from the economic sanctions, he put forward a new Sudan, a Sudan not known by anybody except himself, from Nov. 4 and on. The world started to ask, what will happen to the economic situation in Sudan? What is the impact of the economic sanctions on Sudan? Because the world does not know the nature of the economic relations between Sudan and the U.S.A.

Sudan has actually been under economic sanctions for 14 years. Since 1983, there have been no assistance programs from the U.S.A. to Sudan. The trade balance is only \$60 million, and it is in favor of the U.S.A., and there are no foreign investors from the United States. Sudan has foreign investors from France, from Austria, Germany, China, Canada, Russia—everywhere except from the U.S.A. And of course, this is a part of the policy to exert more pressure on the Sudanese government.

The only connection, economically speaking, between Washington and Khartoum, is gum arabic. Sudan produces 80% of the world's output of this commodity. Six hundred American companies benefitted from this, and they have no artificial replacement for it. In other words, if they put sanctions on Sudan, to stop economic relations, to stop buying gum arabic, the companies will have to buy it, at higher prices, from European and Japanese companies. It is very important for making sodas—Coca-Cola, Pepsi-Cola—fruit drinks, printers' ink, pharmaceutical products, and so forth.

Also, in the “new world disorder” mentioned by a previous speaker, on last Sept. 29, the U.S. State Department said it would bring its diplomats back to Khartoum; immediately, the next day, they reversed that decision. Many media interviewed me about this, asking, “What do you call this?” I said, “I call this schizophrenic. That is the only way I can say it.” Because the people from the U.S.A. who have actually lived in Sudan, who have visited there, who interact with Sudanese politicians and Sudanese realities, they have a different perception and different knowledge, than those who are sitting far away and have an agenda about what should be forced down the throats of the Sudanese people. As for this circle of people, with their own agenda, they are people who are victimized by the mentality of the Cold War. When Communism collapsed, they put up a new Cold War design against what they call political Islam.

To give you just one example: Now, the Sudan file is in the hands of certain people, for example, Mrs. Madeleine Albright and Mrs. Susan Rice. Both of them are political scientists, who specialized, in the case of Mrs. Albright, in Eastern European politics during the Cold War. You know, and I know, and everybody knows, that many universities have now closed down their departments specializing in such studies. Susan Rice is also a scholar of Soviet affairs. Now,

they are part of the U.S. administration. They have the same mentality, the same mind-set, in dealing with the situations in central Africa and eastern Africa. I don't know if they are lacking good advisers, or perhaps they may need another few years to come to understand the real situation in the area. But that means we will bleed more blood, and have more economic destruction.

We have been fighting this war for 42 years! We are committed to not allowing our children to keep on doing so. If military power could solve this problem, it would have been solved a long time ago.

As I said, we are committed to peace in Sudan, but some unwise decisions—I am trying to use as mild words as I can, to describe the situation—taken by superpowers in the area, have complicated the situation, at the expense of people's lives.

Why Sudan?

Why Sudan? You don't read about these facts, but I can give you facts, documented, the whole story of why Sudan is targeted. They say that Sudan is targeted because it harbors international terrorism. This is what people with the Cold War mentality say. We say to them: Up to 1990, Nelson Mandela was classified as a terrorist, and the African National Congress was a “terrorist organization.” Just a few years later, those who were trying to cover up the reality about Mandela, about the African National Congress, could no longer resist the strong current of facts which at last prevailed. And now, Mandela is respected as one of the great characters of the 20th century.

This is the kind of situation we are in.

Just a few days ago, Mujahideen e Khalq, the Iranian opposition group, which used to be the darling of some Western countries, was suddenly put on the list of terrorist organizations. Why? The only reason: to give a positive signal to the new administration in Teheran. So, such classifications are *purely* political. The charges against Sudan are intended to urge the poor neighbors of Sudan to launch war against Sudan, as Mrs. Albright, in her visit to Uganda a few days ago, sought to make a third foreign military intervention in Sudan. If we ask, “Why are you doing this?” they say, “Because Sudan is harboring terrorism.” This is what we call an apology which is more awkward than the mistake. The military act, by itself, is a serious mistake, and the justification is baseless and even more awkward.

When Sudan was added to the list of terrorist nations, it was in August 1993. Please, every one of you, go to three sources: 1) the record of the State Department; 2) the record of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the U.S. Congress; 3) the coverage of the *Washington Post* the day after the decision was taken. There was *no* reason given. It was the *policy*. The only “reasons,” were disposable reasons. I remember, very clearly, when the Foreign Affairs Committee asked the representative of the State Department, “What is the reason

you are adding Sudan to this list?" He paused for a while, giving no answer, then, at the end, he said, "Because Sudan is helping Mohammed Farah Aideed, in Somalia." The whole committee laughed at him! This was reported by the *Washington Post*.

Now, Mrs. Albright and Mrs. Rice no longer talk about supporting Aideed. They say something different, and tomorrow, you will hear something different still. They are "disposable reasons"; it is a *policy*. Why is it a policy? I am coming to this conclusion.

At the beginning of my speech, I said, "Sudan is a mini-mized Africa." In Sudan, you have Arabic culture, in a part of Africa. You have black color: the black of the majority of the people in the country. Also, you have Muslims. This is the intellectual makeup of Sudan: Africans in skin and color; Arabs; Africans in culture; and Muslims also, the majority of them. Being a black person, as you know, is not very popular among some people in the world. Their minds, for various reasons, cannot treat the matter scientifically or fairly. Being Arab, too, is not popular—you know that. Being a Muslim, for political reasons, is the same. But in a nation like Sudan, when your fate is to be African, Muslim, and Arab at the same time—these aspects are melted together—you cannot emphasize one at the expense of another. When we have a case like the present, we need ultra-open-minded people, like you at this gathering, especially, and ultra-open-hearted people, to listen to the truth and the facts we are displaying before them.

False allegations against us

We in Sudan are not terrorists. When you use this allegation of a "terrorist nation," it serves Sudan negatively in two ways. First, it prohibits the rest of the world from coming to see for themselves; and it is also used, at the UN Security Council, for example, to prohibit Sudan's officials from coming to convey their message. The same people who are spreading the manufactured, demonized, evil image about Sudan, in the media, are the ones who created the catastrophe of the Taliban movement in Afghanistan, the most bloody, medieval movement that you can imagine. Who made it? The same people who are accusing Sudan of these things, which Sudan does not do. At the same time, they sometimes talk about having a model of "Westminster democracy" in Sudan. We tried it, by the way, in the '50s, and '60s, and '80s. We know the consequences, and we know the practices. We are trying to exploit, as much as we can, our previous experiences in this regard, in our present and future political life.

The same people who are calling on us to have Westminster democracy, are the superpowers, in central and eastern Africa, who install and sponsor ethnic-minority-based governments. The same powers! We have six neighbors around us, on the east and south; these governments are ethnic-minority-based governments. And you know how they are installed and how they are sponsored. Uganda, as was just mentioned

by Mr. Ssemogerere [see his speech in *EIR*, Jan. 9, 1998], is one of them. John Garang, in southern Sudan, is part of this parcel. He is a minority among the Sudanese southerners; the majority of southerners are not with him, and he knows this. That is why, for no political cause, he is trying to fight his way, to get something by the gun. If he were to stand for election, he would lose. In the whole Upper Nile, he has not a single vote! In the majority of Bahr Al Ghazal, he will not win, for sure. In Equatoria they considered him as a foreign invader. But, through \$20 million arms last November, reported by the *Washington Post*, and, last August, \$8 million food and other supplies, and \$2 million mentioned three days ago in Kampala by Mrs. Albright, they are trying to make him a serious figure in the area. So, the policy in the area is to have alliances with the minorities against the majorities. And this is the other extreme side against democracy.

So, when the same powers who created these people come to Sudan and tell the Sudanese people what to do and how to behave, we will not take them as sincere or serious. Not at all! We appeal to them: Please, as much as you support peace in Bosnia-Herzegovina, as much as you sponsored peace in the Middle East, as much as you sponsored peace in Angola, please give peace a chance in Sudan. We have been having this killing for 42 years.

The last point to mention: We were colonized by Britain for 57 years. I could tell you the kind of propaganda they said about the Sudan government during that time: "It is extreme, it is hostile, it threatens its citizens," and so forth. This is what they said: more or less the same propaganda campaign as we have now. What is the reality? The reality is that Barings Bank, which collapsed in 1995, is the bank of Lord Cromer's family—his name is Evelyn Barings. They financed the military operation of Lord Kitchener in Sudan [in 1898]. Why? To exploit the vast Sudanese land for cotton production, to bring the cotton to the Lancastershire textile industry. So, the whole story of colonizing Sudan is a foreign investment project, financed by that bank.

Now, John Garang is a foreign investment project. We, as a government, are paying \$1 million every day; I don't say how much blood—I leave this aside—or how many handicapped, or injured, or killed, or children in the South, at the age of 19, who don't go to school, because of the war. But, we are paying \$1 million per day for the military effort. Since the latest episode began, March 1983, we have paid over \$4 billion, and we have very little money. The question is, who is paying the bill for the rebels in the South? It must be someone who is investing in them, who will give them almost free licenses for oil, agriculture, minerals, and so forth. And the latest map, provided by John Garang, to break up the country, included *all the oil area, all the sources of water, all the uranium resources*. And all of these are places that have been documented as having rich reserves. That means, the companies that are now disguised, behind the scenes, funnelling money to Garang, are waiting for his success, so that they will

have what they want, almost for free. You want gold? Take it! Uranium? Oil? And so forth.

Sudan's achievements

In Sudan, we consider citizenship — not religion, not ethnic origin, not geographic relations — as the measure for duties and obligations. This is why you have all shades of opinion and religions in the government, the civil service, the military, the police.

In education, eight years ago, we had five universities; now we have 26. All good governments in this world invest in education.

As for the condition of women — a problem in many parts of the world — we now have universities where the girl students outnumber the boy students. Forty-eight percent of the Ministry of Justice labor force are women. In the Supreme Court, the highest legal body in the country, 4 judges out of 10 are women. Just compare this to the rest of the developing world!

We had an economic growth rate of 5.5% in 1997 — just compare that to the rates of the other countries in the area. This rate is certified by the IMF, by the way. During the previous government, the rate was \square 1%, certified by that same organization. We reduced inflation from 168% to 28%. And, we pay, monthly, \$5 million to the IMF as debt service on the loans given to the *former* governments, not to this government. This government has not borrowed a single dollar from outside the country. That means, we are repenting for the sins of others. Five million dollars: This is a huge amount of money, and we would know how to manage it very well; we could build a lot of hospitals, a lot of roads, a lot of labs, a lot of schools. But if we don't pay that debt service, we would just provide a justification to those who are running after us, through the economy or military means, or through the media.

This year, we produced 5.3 million tons of food — this is far above the national need for food, so now, we export food. We used to produce at a low level, unfortunately, because of an inefficient government, the darling of some countries. But now, we export.

Many friends are asking us: Will you allow this? Will you allow that? We say, the people will decide these matters. But, believe me, the people of Sudan will never forget the shame and the hurt of being one day starved by their government, to the extent of having to be fed by foreigners in their own land. Never again! It will not happen.

By the end of this year, Sudan will be self-sufficient in petrol, in oil. And, we will start exporting.

All of these accomplishments were made without any connection with the IMF. Without any advice, or money, or assistance programs. And this is a model: Through sheer self-reliance, and by mobilizing your own people, and articulating your own programs, and exploiting your own natural resources, you can make it.

Interview: Natalya Vitrenko

The world needs a New Bretton Woods

Natalya Vitrenko, Doctor of Economic Sciences, is a member of the Supreme Rada (Parliament) of Ukraine from the Progressive Socialist Party of Ukraine. In February 1997, she co-initiated, with Schiller Institute founder Helga Zepp LaRouche, the "Appeal to President Clinton to Convoke a New Bretton Woods Conference" (see EIR, March 7, 1997). Karl-Michael Vitt of the Schiller Institute interviewed Dr. Vitrenko in Kiev, on Jan. 22.

Q: What do you have to say, as the co-author of the appeal to President Clinton for a New Bretton Woods conference, about the great financial crisis unfolding today in Southeast Asia?

Vitrenko: The outbreak of this crisis has affirmed the theoretical, scientific basis of the LaRouche movement, especially the great service of Lyndon LaRouche in revealing the roots of this crisis, as well as the timeframe in which it would develop.

For us, it is also important to underscore that lying propaganda and horrific censorship have generally concealed from the Ukrainian people the real facts about what is happening in the world, including in finance. My source for full information, on the crisis that is actually going on, is *EIR* magazine, the LaRouche newspapers; there, as an economist, I can see the real scope of this tragedy.

Q: How do you view the financial and economic situation in Ukraine at this time?

Vitrenko: The crisis in Ukraine is deepening, because every economic policy, carried out according to International Monetary Fund prescriptions, is aimed at the destruction of material production.

It must be said again, that the President, and each of our successive governments, are lying to the people about the condition of the economy, by making reference *only* to the monetary curve, using inflation as an artificial measuring rod. Thus, there is constant talk about processes, a process of improvement in the economy, such as the reining in of inflation, or financial stabilization, and it is forecast that 1998 will be the year that economic growth begins in Ukraine. This is forced upon public opinion, in order to get people, first of all,