

Let's Tell the Truth About Sudan

by Lawrence K. Freeman

Washington, D.C. has been awash over recent weeks with forums about the crisis in Darfur, Sudan, which feature speakers from the far lunatic right to those with a more moderate outlook. The *Washington Post* has been filled with editorials and commentary attacking Sudan. Hypocritically, many of the sponsors and participants in these events don't really give a damn about the people of Sudan, much less about the welfare of hundreds of millions of sub-Saharan Africans, who are barely existing in some of the worst conditions, not fit for human beings on this planet. Otherwise the conditions in Darfur, and other regions like Darfur, would never have been allowed to fester. Members of the Congressional Black Caucus demonstrate and partake in their symbolic arrests outside the Sudanese Embassy, with support from many gullible and naive African Americans.

Of course, no one would deny that there is a grave humanitarian crisis in Darfur, accentuated by tribal militia fighting. But, how did it come about? Why has it flared up over the recent period? What forces are behind this "new" hot spot boiling over at this time, and for what purpose? An intelligent citizen concerned about the world might ask such questions, rather than mindlessly following what passes for public opinion about Sudan and Africa. Remember several years ago, when all the same institutions were whipping up the American population, and the same "black leaders," over slavery in Sudan, and then it finally leaked out that it was all a big scam.

Don't be fooled again.

Development or Genocide?

The truth is that forces in the Anglo-American establishment led by Great Britain, have sought the dismembering of the nation of Sudan for decades. Nothing less than the overthrow of the Khartoum government, and division of the nation into warring factions, and/or the imposition of an international military strike force, acting as mercenaries operating freely inside Sudan, are their ultimate goals. In the present collapse of the world financial-monetary system, Sudan's land, resources, and its geopolitical strategic positioning in Eastern Africa, which borders Southwest Asia, are coveted as valuable possessions. Add to this Harvard ideologue Samuel Huntington's racist "Clash of Civilization" diatribe against Islam, and Britain's vintage racial-imperialist dreams about Africa, as outlined in Henry Kissinger's National Security Study Memorandum 200 (Dec. 10, 1974), and you have some very ugly-evil motivations at work.

As anyone who has been to Sudan (or other sub-Saharan nations) can easily know, this is a poor nation, but one, like many others, super-rich in human and physical potential. Since the 1960s cultural paradigm-shift against technological development of the "Third World" in favor of malthusian depopulation, the policy of the International Monetary Fund, World Bank, and allied institutions has been to reduce the sub-Saharan population by war, famine, disease, and pestilence. Let the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse be the instrument of genocide for much of the continent, they say. Why allege genocide only in Darfur? Haven't more horrible crimes against humanity been done to almost the whole continent for over 30 years, under the bankers' rule?

Why haven't there been massive national and regional infrastructure projects to provide clean and safe water, plentiful electrical power, and efficient transportation in Africa? Because they were not *intended* to be built. Look at Darfur. How much water is available for personal consumption, for livestock and agriculture? For decades, the Darfur region like many others has suffered, including local armed struggles, due to the *lack of water*. Any sane concerned person would help Darfur, Sudan, and the rest of Africa, to develop their vast agricultural potential, with basic water projects like canals, so the swamps don't absorb what little water there is, and through water management increase the flow of fresh water. What hypocrisy it is to talk about genocide against the Darfurians, when the policy from Western institutions has been genocide all along, through the deliberate prevention of the growth of their physical economies.

United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan said, that only 40% of the humanitarian needs for Darfur have been met so far. Yet wouldn't it be far wiser in the long term to help this region agriculturally blossom, than have dozens of NGOs fail in their effort, no matter how heroic some of their efforts may be in attempting to provide emergency food, water, and other vital supplies? But such long-term investments in basic infrastructure are not considered *profitable* by the so-called markets, and especially not for Africans!

Some Signs of Moderation

When Secretary of State Colin Powell foolishly declared the crisis in Darfur to be genocide, whether out of ignorance, or pressure, he gave the two rebel organizations that initiated the military escalation last February, the green light to ignore the peace talks sponsored by the African Union, in Abuja,