

to attend the next round of talks scheduled to begin on May 16, on the pretext that the government bombarded civilian areas controlled by the rebels. On June 20, the SPLM announced its willingness to resume negotiations; this resumption was not possible until Sept. 21, and five months elapsed as a result of these delaying tactics of the rebel movement so as to gain time to try one of the two other tricks declared by Garang as alternative ways to solve the issue of Southern Sudan: by toppling the government or by defeating it. In summary, there was little progress during year 2000.

The burden of the blame lies upon the rebel movement and the international powers supporting its designs, namely, the U.S. Administration, which did not bother to hide its agenda in using the war as an instrument to overthrow the Khartoum government. Other regional parties have their own agenda, and some of them, although considering themselves mediators, did not manage to conceal their hostility toward the government of Sudan. Some observers do not spare the Secretariat of the blame of being passive and unchallenging.

The IPFs exert very little pressure to make the SPLM accept the comprehensive cease-fire, which will show that the rebel movement is finally resorting to a peaceful solution to the conflict. Some of them even do not entertain the idea of stopping some of the NGOs supplying the movement with arms and ammunition. It is widely known that U.S. agencies paid tens of millions of dollars to the SPLA using humanitarian aid as a disguise.

31. What Is To Be Done?

The impasse opened the way for new initiatives to try to solve the problem. One of these initiatives is the Egyptian-Libyan initiative, which tried to convene all the parties including the NDA [National Democratic Alliance], but this effort did not succeed because the rebel movement showed no enthusiasm toward what it calls Arab initiatives. The movement claims that there is no possibility to merge the IGAD initiative and the Arab one because the Egyptians will never accept the principle of self-determination for the people of Southern Sudan. Thus, the current situation shows no real chance of a peaceful solution. If a peaceful solution is to be reached, the IGAD members, African countries, and IPFs should:

- Show more concern about the peace process by activating the role of the IGAD Council of Ministers so as to support the Secretariat to be much more positive in its role as a mediator.
- The Secretariat should be firm and not accept any form of deviation from the DOP.
- The IGAD members and the IPFs should pressure the SPLM to agree to a comprehensive cease-fire, so as to open the gateway for a peaceful solution and to apply pressure on the movement to negotiate in good faith.

Tagilsir Maghoub

Toward a Dialogue Among Civilizations

Dr. Maghoub is Secretary General of Sudan's National Fund for State Support. Subheads have been added.

Based on my responsibility as Secretary General of the National Fund for State Support, which is responsible for the wealth-sharing aspect, I would like to focus on this issue and its contribution to the peace process. Mr. Amin has provided the background, to see the steps taken so far.

Last night, while I was reflecting on the issue of peace, I started thinking about what the word "peace" itself stands for. When we start talking about certain things, I take every letter of the word, and see what it stands for. *P* is political will: If there is will and determination to solve the problem, it can be done. *E* is empathy, putting yourself in the other person's shoes and doing what can be done. *A* is the accommodative spirit, trying to accommodate each other, and help pave the way for a peaceful settlement. *C* is conflict resolution through confidence-building, which is key to resolving the peace issue. *E* is the execution of commitments, through political will, empathy, etc. This will pave the way to a final peaceful settlement. That's a simple exercise, as an introduction.

The Sudan Conflict

Thinking along the same lines, let us come to the roots of the Sudan conflict. There is the vulnerability of economic security, inequitable power and wealth sharing, a feeling of lack of enhancement of human dignity, and the role of the international agenda. All four contribute to deepening the conflict.

Sometimes we fail to assess what the adverse consequences of the conflict are, what the cost of that conflict is. If we look at the economic and human cost of war lingering for a long time, we find it has created a number of adverse consequences, the first of which is the destruction of the social fabric; it has created separation of families, massive dislocation, weakening of social institutions, erosion of power of the leadership, massive environmental destruction, devastation of the productive base and infrastructure, drainage of resources away from development to security-related expenses, deterioration of education and basic services, and poverty. These are the outcomes of the lack of peace. In the situation in the south, due to the lingering of war, which is being ignited every now and then, if we look at agriculture, we find it is

extremely traditional; although there is abundant forestry, fisheries, wildlife, water resources, these are not utilized because of the war. The illiteracy rate is high, there are weaknesses in the industrial base and transportation infrastructure, potential resources are not developed.

These are clear manifestations of the raging conflict, in spite of the efforts under way to try to end the conflict.

Based on that, the need for peace is clear. To help provide efficient government, we must focus on four important elements, which are the elements of development. These are: infrastructure, agricultural development, utilization of natural resources, and promotion of the industrial base. These need to be focussed on, if peace is to be established. That will help enhancing human capabilities and enlarging people's choices through a steady expansion of opportunities, including access to jobs and employment opportunities, access to productive assets such as land and credit, basic education and health, and basic infrastructure.

This puts on all, the national responsibility, to realize peace through political will and synergy of ideas.

What are the real issues that are priority items? As we said, economic vulnerability and the grievance that has been created over long years by the fact that there is no fairness, and no justice, so the issues of power- and wealth-sharing have always surfaced as important issues to be addressed. Power-sharing, we believe, has already been taken care of through the federal structure. The South now enjoys the federal structure; it has got its own states, its own government, its own legislative assemblies, and it has got its own way of running affairs in the South, within the federal structure. This was one of the focal points in the negotiations.

The other aspect is wealth-sharing, which deals with livelihood, with welfare of people and the real development that is needed. Of course, development can only be achieved through just, fair, and equitable wealth-sharing; this is the issue I am going to focus on.

Some steps have been taken. In the last round of talks, in the seminar on wealth-sharing held in Nairobi, one important issue agreed on was, that political, social, and economic activities must center on the enhancement of human dignity of all Sudanese, irrespective of gender, religion, ethnicity, or region. And revenue-sharing is critical to stability and sustainable human development. Accordingly, there should be equity in the allocation and effective management of common wealth, which draws on human experiences from the rest of the world.

What has been done in that respect? We feel that a lot of steps have been taken in the area of wealth-sharing. At the beginning, it was a question of assessing the needs of the various states, and on that basis, a certain allocation is made from national revenues, to take care of basic needs. What we started to do, because we think that equitable, just sharing needs information, is to create a database, this wealth of information which would help give people what they deserve

within the structure set up. So we set up an encyclopedia, and focussed on all the states. Now the information available on all the states is ample. Each state has its own set of the encyclopedia. For Equatoria, we have 120 dimensions, revenues, natural resources, population mix and density, health, water, services. This gives a true picture of what potential is there, how that potential could be tapped, what the responsibility of the central government is in providing what is needed to move the sectors. On that basis, a formula was set, to establish a system of wealth- and revenue-sharing. The outcome was a certain set of criteria established in the areas, and how this wealth could be divided between the different parts of the country, the central government and the local governments. There has been a constant increase in the allotments; for instance, on a percentage basis, from 7-9% to 15% of the national revenues, to take care of the basic infrastructure projects. In this respect a lot has been done.

In the area of wealth-sharing, what is required in each part of the country, why, what are the criteria, what are the ways to be assigned, for each area to get its use of central government revenues.

In 2001, there is an increase in the sharing process to the states, particularly in the South. In the last round of talks, some ideas came up which helped us to have a new vision in the wealth-sharing area, to solve some real problems, which hindered the peace process from going on with the pace we believed necessary. These have taken into consideration all the needs. There is a massive program to be launched in 2001, already started in 2000: a program for resettlement, core projects for sustainable development, health, manpower, water. Now this is being done in a crash program for the South, to provide potable water, health, education, power, roads—important infrastructure. The first phase of the crash program has been carried out; the second phase is going on.

This includes promoting agricultural development as the basis of other development, working toward creating an industrial base in the region, and enhancing human dignity through all of the above. Everything that is done contributes to emphasizing human dignity.

Steps have been taken to ensure the stability of the workforce, through an equalized system of payment, whereby the system of payment in the South is the same as in the North.

It depends on how you look at it: Is the glass half-full or half-empty? We have to look at it as half-full, and hope.

There is a role that the international community should play: Be genuine about achieving peace, not talking about it as a cliché; be genuine about establishing peace, and about what the outcomes are; support genuine efforts to achieving peace; honestly contribute to local development; stop igniting differences, under any sort of cover. They talk about it as a religious conflict, trying to deepen cleavage, through certain arguments. We know there are international agendas playing a role here. Mr. LaRouche's paper on the dialogue of cultures and religious warfare, addresses this.