

With the Name of Allah, The Beneficent, The Compassionate.

This is the official Bandung2 response to a letter received from Moeen Yaseen, Managing Director of Global Vision 2000, concerning comments received in regard to the presentation "The Field, The House and The Yard: Reflections on Racial Political Economy" delivered by one of its representatives at the Global Vision 2000 Conference on Saturday 13 December 2008.

Moeen Yaseen:

*It is important to be clear on several matters and I wish to make the position of Global Vision 2000 clear. Global Vision 2000 is an independent Islamic thinktank which is providing an intellectual space for different organisations to collaborate and express diverse opinions which **may** have the potential for future collaboration. We do not and can not be held responsible for the views of the participants invited inclusive of BANDUNG2.*

Bandung2:

In the official response from the Bandung2 movement concerning comments received in regard to the presentation "The Field, The House and The Yard: Reflections on Racial Political Economy" delivered by one of its representatives at the Global Vision 2000 Conference on Saturday 13 December 2008 (http://www.bandung2.co.uk/Articles/Files/Bandung2/Bandung2_Response_to_Criticism.pdf), the following statement appears:

Concerning the question "surely GV2000 is about bringing people together and building bridges not alienating them?", given that the Bandung2 representative was not authorised to speak on behalf of Global Vision 2000 by Moeen Yaseen, he cannot and will not do so. However, the stated remit of this "independent, international, Islamic think-tank" is collaboration and, therefore, "bringing people together". It is the understanding of Bandung2 that such "bringing together" must include the "bringing together" of individuals reflecting a range/diversity of positions, including those that some might deem unpalatable and/or "offensive".

It is the position of the Bandung2 movement that nothing in the above statement is in conflict with Moeen Yaseen's stated position that Global Vision 2000 does not and cannot be held responsible for the views of the participants invited inclusive of Bandung2.

Moeen Yaseen:

Further to the shura conducted which we hope you take with the right spirit and attitude. There is a general consensus amongst scholars present and others (Muslim and Western inclusive of nonwhites) consulted about the following remarks.

Bandung2:

The Bandung2 movement was not invited to participate in the aforementioned *shura* (consultation), nor was it made aware of the constituent membership of the consultative body which appears to have reached "a general consensus amongst scholars present and others (Muslim and Western inclusive of nonwhites)" concerning certain "remarks" made by the Bandung2 representative at the aforementioned event. Without knowing the credentials of the "scholars" being referred to and their credibility vis-à-vis ability to assess the correctness or otherwise of claims made by the Bandung2 movement, it is impossible to determine what value to attach to any "general consensus" reached by such a body. Nonetheless, the Bandung2 movement is prepared to respond to all criticisms directed at the Bandung2 representative by the consultative body.

Moeen Yaseen:

One would have been able to make an immediate assessment if the presentation was vetted beforehand which it was not. We will ensure that this procedural error is not made again regardless of the timing factor or who the speaker is.

Bandung2:

Firstly, Global Vision 2000 is welcome to "vet" any materials produced by the Bandung2 movement. However, the real issue is whether Global Vision 2000 and/or its affiliated scholars are qualified to assess the correctness or otherwise of the given material. Given what follows, this is, at the very least, debatable.

Secondly, Global Vision cannot claim that it was not aware of the content to be delivered by the Bandung2 representative at the conference on Saturday 13 December 2000 since this was essentially the same as that presented at the Global Vision 2000 conference held on Saturday 5 April 2008.

Moeen Yaseen:

Whilst we agree with some of the key themes of your presentation, the manner of its delivery was easily open to misinterpretation and misconstrual. This is a problem of delivery - if delivering a theme that one knows to be extremely sensitive, then one has to ensure that the right tone and language is used. Unfortunately your approach was too heavy for an audience who'd never been exposed to this kind of analysis.

Bandung2:

It is not clear what these "key themes" of the presentation made by the Bandung2 representative are, nor which of them were agreeable to Global Vision 2000. The Bandung2 representative delivered a presentation on racial political economy based on the understanding that Racism (White Supremacy) is a globally operating system.

More seriously, the Bandung2 movement takes the view that it is incorrect to (attempt to) speak for and/or on behalf of an audience since it is the right of each and every individual present at an event to determine for himself/herself whether the "approach was too heavy", whether there was a "problem with delivery" and/or whether "the right tone and language" was used. What right does Global Vision 2000 have to speak for all members of an audience? Did Global Vision 2000 obtain this right from each and every individual in the audience beforehand? If not, then this right has been usurped unjustly, irrespective of whether this was done intentionally or otherwise.

Moeen Yaseen:

Secondly we also believe that your argument is fundamentally flawed.

Bandung2:

That is, of course, quite possible. However, whether this is indeed the case will depend on the correctness or otherwise of the **evidence** presented and the correctness or otherwise of the **interpretation** of this evidence. In addition, it is unclear what is meant by the term "argument."

Moeen Yaseen:

That's not to say we don't disagree that multiple forms of Xenophobia and Racism are key discourses that partially explain the nature of contemporary imperial power structures.

Bandung2:

Firstly, according to the wording of the above statement, which involves a double negative, it would appear that Global Vision 2000 does not agree that "multiple forms of Xenophobia and Racism are key discourses that partially explain the nature of contemporary imperial power structures." However, the Bandung2 movement believes that what was intended was to assert the following:

That's not to say we don't **agree** that multiple forms of Xenophobia and Racism are key discourses that partially explain the nature of contemporary imperial power structures.

Secondly, why are the terms Xenophobia and Racism capitalised and how are these terms defined?

Thirdly, it is assumed that "Xenophobia and Racism" are "key discourses." This is incorrect. Racism (White Supremacy) is not a discourse - it is the dominant, contemporary, globally operating system of power relations.

Fourthly, what does the phrase "contemporary imperial power structures" refer to? What is meant by an "imperial power structure"?

Moeen Yaseen:

Your wish to focus your efforts on the racist dimension of power relations is very worthwhile.

Bandung2:

It is incorrect to state that the Bandung2 movement focuses its efforts on the "racist dimension" of power relations. Rather, the Bandung2 movement focuses its efforts on replacing White Supremacy (Racism) with justice. According to the Bandung2 movement, the only functional, contemporary globally operating system of power relations is Racism (White Supremacy).

Moeen Yaseen:

But to argue that 500 years of world history can be explained purely on the basis of "White Supremacist Racism" is highly oversimplifying, and frankly untrue.

Bandung2:

Firstly, the Bandung2 movement does not know what the term "White Supremacist Racism" means. In all its published materials, the Bandung2 movement refers to the dominant, contemporary, globally operating system of power relations as either White Supremacy (Racism) or Racism (White Supremacy). On this definition, "White Supremacist" is not an adjectival qualifier of "Racism." The only functional and systemic form of Racism is White Supremacy.

Secondly, the Bandung2 movement does not claim that "500 years of world history can be explained purely on the basis of ..." Rather, the Bandung2 movement claims that Racism (White Supremacy) is a globally operating system of power relations that has developed over the last 500 years of history. The two claims are quite distinct and should not be confused.

Moeen Yaseen:

What about the tens of millions of Eastern Europeans and Russians who died as a direct consequence of IMF and World Bank structural adjustment programmes and under Stalin?

Bandung2:

Firstly, there is no logical and/or existential contradiction between claiming that the dominant, contemporary, globally operating system of power relations is White Supremacy (Racism) and recognising that certain institutions such as the IMF, World Bank and/or WTO and individuals such as Stalin have been responsible for the deaths of tens of millions of Eastern Europeans and Russians. The oppression and destruction of people classified as white by other people classified as white does not change the existential fact of Racism (White Supremacy); to argue otherwise is to commit a *non sequitur*, a fallacy of reasoning, since the two claims are quite independent of each other.

Secondly, the examples referred to here are instances of what might be regarded as "white-on-white" violence. None of these were perpetrated by people classified as "black" and/or non-white on people classified as white. While the Bandung2 movement concurs with Mills' statement (1997) that "there were also *intra*-European varieties of 'racism' – Teutonism, Anglo-Saxonism, Nordicism" (p.79), and that the Irish, Jews, Slavs, Mediterraneans and other Europeans have indeed been subject to genocide and oppression, this does not, in any way, detract from the existential fact of Racism (White Supremacy) as the dominant, contemporary globally operating system of power relations. It is crucial to appreciate that Mills' refers to *intra*-European oppression as 'racism', not Racism, in order to

distinguish between local "white-on-white" non-systemic violence and the structure of systemic oppression that is "the global racial polity" (Mills 1997, p.79).

Moeen Yaseen:

What, indeed, about the British colonisation of Ireland, which proceeded for almost half a millenium?

Bandung2:

As stated previously, the historical, and even contemporary, existence of instances of (sustained) "white-on-white" violence does not conflict with the existential reality of Racism (White Supremacy) as the dominant, contemporary, globally operating system of power relations. However, it is worthwhile briefly mentioning that it is debatable whether the Irish have always been considered "white" anyway. On this point, the Bandung2 movement recommends consulting the literature on the subject written by white scholars such as Bonnett (2000a, 2000b), Rolston and Shannon (2002), Garner (2007) and Ignatiev (2008) among others.

Moeen Yaseen:

What about the reversal of power in South Africa after apartheid was abolished - where ongoing policies of affirmative action have according to many resulted in the marginalization of both whites and asians from structures of power?

Bandung2:

Firstly, the Bandung2 movement disputes the claim that there was a "reversal of power" in South Africa after Apartheid was abolished. It is common knowledge that the post-Apartheid government is fully dependent on Western – more accurately, White Supremacist (Racist) – investment. Furthermore, under conditions of Racism (White Supremacy), there cannot be any real and/or substantial "reversal of power" since if this were possible, White Supremacy (Racism) would no longer exist. Alleged local "reversals of power" are precisely that – alleged – and are **allowed** to occur in the interests of maintaining Racism (White Supremacy). If the globally operating system of Racism (White Supremacy) has to make concessions – such as granting so-called **political** "independence" – to certain non-white people in order to maintain the system of White Supremacy (Racism), it will do so. This would be considered a functional refinement (or adaptation) of the system.

Secondly, who is this "many" that is being referred to?

Thirdly, what is the meaning of "marginalization" of whites given the fact that their historical presence in Africa was/is a direct consequence of colonialism – more precisely, Racism (White Supremacy)? Contemporary whites in South Africa who are the descendants of settlers/colonists may not have been "signatories" to the "Racial Contract" of Apartheid, however, they are indeed its beneficiaries (Mills 1997). "Policies of affirmative action", whether effective or otherwise, are nothing but attempts to redress the systemic and structural imbalance – social, political, economic and otherwise - that is the legacy of Racism (White Supremacy).

Fourthly, the existence and dynamics of "intra-non-white" – specifically, "black"- "asian" – conflicts does not conflict with the existential fact of Racism (White Supremacy) as the dominant, contemporary, globally operating system of power relations.

Moeen Yaseen:

Some of this I have had to deal with at all levels in the late 80s and is old hat frankly.

Bandung2:

It is not clear what "this" refers to. Furthermore, the fact that something is "old hat" does not mean that it is not true, nor does it mean that the way – and "level" – at which it was "dealt with" previously was correct and/or effective. Given the continued existence of Racism (White Supremacy), it would appear that such "dealing" has, in fact, been ineffective, at least in the large.

Mooen Yaseen:

Basically, the concept of "White Supremacist Racism" as the organizing principle and static structure explaining all contemporary oppression is theoretically misleading and empirically refuted by such examples. It doesn't explain cases like the British colonisation of Ireland, without admitting that 'white' people could be victims of 'racism', defined in different terms. This doesn't mean that your concept doesn't exist, but we need far more sophisticated and historically-specific models that take into account wide variations in the nature of imperial systems over time and place to understand the relationship between oppression, power relations, discourses of the 'Other', and violence.

Bandung2:

Firstly, as stated previously, it is not clear what is meant by "White Supremacist Racism" since the Bandung2 movement does not use this term, nor is it in possession of a definition of this term.

Secondly, Racism (White Supremacy) is neither an "organizing principle" nor a "static structure explaining all contemporary oppression." Racism (White Supremacy) is the dominant, contemporary globally operating system of power relations and the only structural and functional system of Racism in existence. The Bandung2 movement has never claimed that Racism (White Supremacy) is a "static structure"; on the contrary, it maintains that Racism (White Supremacy) is inherently dynamic since it is subject to ongoing refinement (that is, adaptation). Furthermore, the claim that Racism (White Supremacy) explains all contemporary oppression is incorrect and unsupported by any statement from the Bandung2 movement. On the contrary, as stated in the official response from the Bandung2 movement concerning comments received in regard to the presentation "The Field, The House and The Yard: Reflections on Racial Political Economy" delivered by one of its representatives at the Global Vision 2000 Conference on Saturday 13 December 2008 (http://www.bandung2.co.uk/Articles/Files/Bandung2/Bandung2_Response_to_Criticism.pdf), the Bandung2 does not maintain that this is the only form of supremacy and/or oppression. On the *What is Bandung2?* page of the Bandung2 website, the following statement appears: (<http://www.bandung2.co.uk/home/bandung2.htm>)

Various forms of oppression exist in the world including political repression, **economic exploitation**, **gender discrimination**, child abuse, animal rights violations, environmental destruction etc. **All** of these forms of oppression are injustices and must be confronted and eradicated by any and all legitimate means available. **The Bandung2 movement is committed to seeing this happen.**

As stated previously, Bandung2 takes the view that the **dominant, contemporary** form of oppression in the world is Racism (White Supremacy). Use of the qualifier "dominant" implies the existence of a set of items in which other items are considered **subordinate** – *not* non-existent.

Thirdly, it is incorrect to claim that the examples you cite "empirically refute" the position of the Bandung2 movement concerning the existence of Racism (White Supremacy) as the dominant, contemporary globally operating system of power relations.

Fourthly, it is unclear what is meant by the assertion "this doesn't mean that your concept doesn't exist..." Does this mean that Global Vision 2000 accepts the existential fact of Racism (White Supremacy)?

Fifthly, the assertion that "we need **far more sophisticated** and historically-specific models that take into account wide variations in the nature of imperial systems over time and place to understand the relationship between oppression, power relations, discourses of the 'Other', and violence" is questionable since the need for a more "sophisticated" account has not been demonstrated at all, instances of "white-on-white" violence in the historical record notwithstanding. In the absence of a definition of the term "imperial system", the assertion is, at the very least, confusing – whether this is intentional or otherwise.

Sixthly, the Bandung2 movement is wary of calls for "sophistication" in modeling on account of the tendency towards *sophistry*, that is, deliberately invalid argument displaying ingenuity in reasoning in the hope of deceiving someone. (Among the meanings of "sophisticated" is to be deceitful, devious,

complex, convoluted; to "sophisticate" is to make less natural. One who is "sophisticated" may practice sophistry, that is, change the meaning of (something) or be vague about it in order to mislead or deceive.) In short, calls for "sophistication" are often calls for "confusion" and/or "deception" and must, therefore, be rejected. It is not "sophistication" that is required, but correctness and/or truth.

Moeen Yaseen:

In particular, we shouldn't be surprised that people found some of your generalisations offensive, for example: "all white people are beneficiaries of White Supremacist Racism." (a proposition that can never be proven by the scientific method and is therefore meaningless, and be disproven by findings millions of white people are suffering from serious disenfranchisement and injustice.)

Bandung2:

Firstly, which people found some of the generalisations of the Bandung representative offensive, and what was the nature of the "offence"?

Secondly, without defining what is meant by "the scientific method" – and it is misleading to assert that there is such a thing as *the* scientific method rather than a plurality of competing theories and philosophies of science (Chalmers 1982) – this statement, which is clearly being used for rhetorical (that is, persuasive) purposes, is itself meaningless. For the record, the Bandung representative who gave the presentation at the Global Vision 2000 conference holds a doctorate in a scientific discipline and is fully acquainted with the various philosophical debates concerning scientific method.

Thirdly, the fact that "millions of white people are suffering from serious disenfranchisement and injustice" in no way contradicts the existential fact of Racism (White Supremacy) as the dominant, contemporary, functional globally operating system of power relations. As stated previously, the existence and occurrence of "white-on-white" violence is fully consistent with Racism (White Supremacy). It may also be an instantiation of what is known as Major Racial Sacrifice Confusion – that is, the deliberate oppression and/or extermination of whites **by other whites** for the purposes of maintaining Racism (White Supremacy) and/or confusing the non-white victims of this globally operating system.

Fourthly, as stated previously, the system is Racism (White Supremacy), not "White Supremacist Racism."

Moeen Yaseen:

Actually, if White Supremacist Racism is supposed to be the fundamental defining character of the entire global system, and all local systems within it, then how does this account for the fact that it's not just white people, but 'black' people, who are also beneficiaries of the system? By virtue of being able to shop at supermarkets, buy from western clothes retailers, drive cars or even use public transport, by virtue of simply consuming in this society, we are direct beneficiaries of the same system. Indeed, some of us 'blacks' are prospering in this system, without necessarily being 'yes men'. If we are not 'beneficiaries', then how exactly are we supposed to define the idea of 'benefiting'?

Bandung2:

Firstly, the system is Racism (White Supremacy), not "White Supremacist Racism."

Secondly, while non-white people are certainly recipients of certain "privileges" (products, services etc) in the system of Racism (White Supremacy), it is important to appreciate that (i) there is **differential access** to such privileges among white people and non-white people, (ii) it is white people who **determine** what privileges are to be **granted to** - and, as a corollary, **withheld from** - non-white people at any point in time and this can change depending on the needs of the system of Racism (White Supremacy), (iii) being the recipient of granted privileges does not, thereby, entail being in a position of **power**, (iv) the system of power relations – and privileges that accrue thereby – that is Racism (White Supremacy) was established, and is maintained, expanded and refined **for** the benefit of people classified as white; the fact that **some** privileges are **also** granted to non-white people within this system – as **concessions** – does not contradict this reality. In this regard, the following

observations by Ricky Lee Allen, a "more class-focused white Marxist" who has transformed "to one who is more race-focused", are significant:

Not all those who **support** white supremacy are white. In a world where whiteness structures human existence, some people of colour do **conform**, consciously or not, to the organising principles of white supremacy. This is how any system of hegemony works. That said, it is important for **white** readers to understand that white **assimilation** to white supremacy is **not the same** as the **internalisation** of white supremacy by people of colour. Although the hegemonic effects of white supremacy on people of colour are there and cannot be ignored, **higher scrutiny should be placed on whites because systemically they are in a greater position of power and privilege**. In other words, the internalisation of whiteness by people of colour should **never** be used by whites as an **excuse** to avoid reflection upon one's active or passive role in the globalisation of white supremacy [emphasis added]. (Allen 2001, p.484)

Thirdly, the slaves kidnapped from Afrika were fed and watered by their white masters on the plantations in America and the Caribbean. These slaves were, therefore, "beneficiaries" of the privileges of food and/or water. Nonetheless, they were slaves and subject to tyranny and oppression.

Moeen Yaseen:

Similarly, if "all non-white people are victims of White Supremacist Racism" (a proposition which can also never be proven by the scientific method and is therefore also meaningless; and further can be disproven empirically by actually finding large numbers of non-white people who don't feel that they are victims in this way), then how can we account for the fact that 48 per cent of Americans living in poverty are white, and that the main increases in poverty over the last year has been among white and Hispanic people, not blacks?

Bandung2:

Firstly, since it is not clear what scientific method is being referred to in the above statement – and, as stated previously, there is no such thing as *the* scientific method anyway – this assertion is meaningless.

Secondly, "finding large numbers of non-white people who don't feel that they are victims" of Racism (White Supremacy) does not, thereby, entail the non-existence of this dominant, functional, globally operating system. It is not a question of "feeling"; it is a question of structural and functional systemic power relations and, according to the research findings of the Bandung2 movement, the historical and contemporary evidence supporting the existential facticity of such relations is, quite simply, irrefutable.

Thirdly, the statistical validity of the alleged racial differential vis-à-vis poverty is debatable. In this connection, the Bandung2 movement would like to refer Global Vision 2000 to material appearing on the UFE (United for a Fair Economy) website, in particular the Racial Wealth Divide (RWD) subpage at http://www.faireconomy.org/issues/racial_wealth_divide and the "State of The Dream 2008" report authored by Amaad Rivera, Brenda Cotto-Escalera, Anisha Desai, Jeannette Huezo and Dedrick Muhammad (http://www.faireconomy.org/files/StateOfDream_01_16_08_Web.pdf).

Moeen Yaseen:

In your oversimplistic theoretical framework, such phenomena are exceptions or anomalies that make no sense, unless we simply admit that "White Supremacist Racism" is not a useful concept if it is put forward as an ultimate explanatory framework. We need a theory that is able to understand how power, in the pursuit of its interests, is able to construct changing discourses of the 'Other', which can be defined along many different categories, including Race, Gender, Class, Religion (as with Muslims), etc. The 'White/Non-White' dichotomy is a caricature of these complex processes, processes that change and evolve over time. We also need to recognize that 'white power' is not necessarily the defining character of power in the contemporary imperial system.

Bandung2:

Firstly, such "phenomena" as, for example, historical and/or contemporary instances of "white-on-white" violence and/or "non-white consumption" of (white-granted) privileges, are not "exceptions or anomalies", but either forms of intra-white tyranny/oppression and/or strategic concessions – that is, functional refinements – that are necessary in order to maintain the system of Racism (White Supremacy).

Secondly, as stated on the homepage of its website (<http://www.bandung2.co.uk>), Bandung2 is a global movement of individuals committed to replacing **all man-made forms of supremacy** with a system of justice based on The Qur'an. The Bandung2 movement recognises that Racism (White Supremacy) is merely a *particular* instantiation of the more *general* phenomenon of supremacism and would refer Global Vision 2000 to an article (http://www.bandung2.co.uk/Articles/Files/Bandung2/Supremacism_and_Islam.htm) that has been written on this issue clarifying the position of the movement.

Thirdly, to refer to the "White/Non-White" dichotomy as "a caricature" is problematic on a number of counts: (i) Bandung2 does not endorse such a "dichotomy". On the contrary, Bandung2 maintains that, under conditions of Racism (White Supremacy), there are three types of people in the known universe: white people, non-white people and White Supremacists (Racists); (ii) Bandung2 makes a clear distinction between white people and White Supremacists (Racists) and maintains that while all White Supremacists (Racists) are necessarily "White" people, not all "White" people are necessarily White Supremacists (Racists); (iii) the use of "caricature" is clearly rhetorical.

Fourthly, as stated previously, Racism (White Supremacy) as the **dominant, contemporary**, functional globally operating system of power relations is inherently dynamic, "changing" and "evolving" – that is, refining – its processes over time in order to maintain itself.

Fifthly, if Racism (White Supremacy) is not the dominant, contemporary, functional globally operating system of power relations, then what is? What is the "contemporary imperial system"?

Moeen Yaseen:

Having said that I did not find the conclusions disturbing at all indeed they can be included in a Global Vision 2000 manifesto. There is thus a concern on the abrasive approach and your selective sources omitting other relevant data.

Bandung2:

Firstly, it is irrelevant to the Bandung2 movement whether Global Vision 2000 chooses to include the "conclusions" presented by the Bandung2 representative in a Global Vision 2000 manifesto.

Secondly, it is questionable whether the approach adopted was "abrasive" since it is not clear what this term means, and who it is that considered the approach to be "abrasive"?

Thirdly, if by "other relevant data" Global Vision is referring to the examples of "white-on-white" crime and/or "non-white privilege" referred to earlier, it is important to appreciate that this data is not in conflict with, nor in any way calls into question, the analysis of the globally operating system of Racism (White Supremacy) presented by the Bandung2 representative.

Fourthly, as to using "selective sources", it is in the nature of all/any discourse to be selective. The **real** issue is whether the sources used and/or material presented is true/correct or false/incorrect and whether it affords an accurate understanding of the nature of the subject under consideration, or whether it misrepresents and/or distorts, intentionally or otherwise, the issue.

Moeen Yaseen:

We should remember we are NOT here just to redress injustices but establish HAQQ vis a vis BATIL in all its manifestations anything else would be a ZULM itself. Whilst Global Vision 2000 is open to collaboration we also think that your contributions would be more relevant and suitable when more explicit political issues are the main theme of the conference.

Bandung2:

Firstly, it is not clear who this "we" is that is being referred to here. Individuals should be allowed to think, speak and/or act for themselves – **as individuals** – unless they **allow** others to speak for them and/or on their behalf. To do otherwise is to usurp the right (*haqq*) of the individual unjustly and is an act of oppression/tyranny (*zulm*).

Secondly, it is not the right (*haqq*) of Global Vision 2000 to determine what anyone is "here" for.

Thirdly, a commitment to redressing *specific* instances of injustice (*zulm*) is fully consistent with establishing truth/right (*haqq*) as such.

Fourthly, Global Vision 2000 is entitled to "think" whatever it likes vis-à-vis collaboration or otherwise with the Bandung2 movement. However, it is incorrect to assume – as is being implied – that the focus of Bandung2 is more political than economic in nature; the Bandung2 movement works at the level of systems and politics and economics are major areas of activity – that is, subsystems – within the globally operating system of Racism (White Supremacy).

Moeen Yaseen:

Your organisation has also demonstrated its support function which is an asset also. This could be used to ensure that the appropriate speakers and organisation are recruited and are in alignment.

Bandung2:

Firstly, Bandung2 is not an organisation, it is a movement.

Secondly, as stated in the FAQ on its website, the Bandung2 movement will work with any individual, group, organisation or movement that is pursuing goals consistent with those of Bandung2. The principal goal is replacing Racism (White Supremacy) with Justice.
(<http://www.bandung2.co.uk/FAQ.htm#16>)

Moeen Yaseen:

Also as mentioned whilst you no doubt have made a contribution to the event happening that is like me saying to you did not Global Vision 2000 provide you a high profile platform which others would probably deny to you if they knew what you had to say. Also I realise the advance info/advert has probably created awareness but I must confess I did not see too much evidence of collaborating organisations membership being in evidence. It appeared people wanting to have a platform to air their views in silo mentality although there is evidence that is changing with some groups.

Bandung2:

Firstly, it is questionable whether the platform provided by Global Vision 2000 is "high-profile" and it is unclear what is meant by this.

Secondly, it is irrelevant whether "others" would deny the Bandung2 movement such a platform since the movement, while accepting such a platform if it is offered, does not **need** any such platform in order to carry out its work.

Thirdly, as stated previously, the Bandung2 movement is **not** an organisation and does **not** have a membership. It is not a "club" and does not, therefore, attempt to put pressure on individuals associated with the movement to participate in any of its activities. Those individuals in the movement

think, speak and/or act as individuals. The Bandung movement is not concerned with helping individuals, organisations and/or movements to fill conference rooms and/or "sell tickets" to events.

In closing, the Bandung2 movement would like to extend an open invitation to Moeen Yaseen, representatives and/or affiliates of Global Vision 2000, and other interested individuals, organisations and/or movements to debate the issues presented in this and other Bandung2 publications in a public forum of their choice.

Peace

The Bandung2 Movement
www.bandung2.co.uk

References

Allen, R.L. (2001) "The Globalization of White Supremacy: Toward a Critical Discourse on the Racialization of The World." *Educational Theory* 51(4), 467-485.

Bonnett, A. (2000a) "Who was white? The disappearance of non-European white identities and the formation of European racial whiteness." In *White Identities: Historical and International Perspectives*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, pp.7-27.

Bonnett, A. (2000b) "How the British working class became white." In *White Identities: Historical and International Perspectives*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, pp.28-45.

Chalmers, A.F. (1982) *What is this thing called science?* Second Edition. Milton Keynes; The Open University Press.

Garner, S. (2007) *Whiteness: An Introduction*. London: Routledge.

Ignatiev, N. (2008) *How The Irish became White*. London: Routledge.

Mills, C.W. (1997) *The Racial Contract*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Rolston, B. and Shannon, M. (2002) *Encounters: How Racism Came to Ireland*. Belfast: Beyond the Pale.