In this paper, I discuss how Sudanese economists, writing in their own journals such as *the Sudanese Economists* and *the Sudanese Journal of Development and Administration*, discussed the state’s contraction of long-term debt. I also address larger questions about the relationship between debt and sovereignty. A subtheme of this paper is the impact of participation in international financial institutions on Sudanese officials’ vision of professionalism.

By 1966, debt and constraint had replace development as the principal topic of conversation within the Sudanese Ministry of Finance and Economics. Economics was at its base a decision-making science, which Sudanese officials who learned its language could practice universally. Their economic debates are filled with the rhetoric of professionalism and good administration. The proliferation of economic journals and study groups in Sudan was not tied to development as much as it was tied to creation of professional class of Sudanese experts who could interface with a global network of economic experts. Professionalism was not an individualistic decision on the part of Sudanese officials seeking cushier jobs and better pay, but a vital tactic in asserting their independence from the political, military and security elites within the state. It was only by internationalizing that finance officials could gain the authority necessary to have a sustained voice in policy debates.

One consequence of this institutional setup was that Sudanese finance officials became as concerned with their own “spatial mobility” and network building as with the development of the Sudanese state or nation. Yet, ironically they remained intrinsically tied to the state, because it was the state that provided them with their entry point into the global networks of economic and financial expertise. Internationalization then allowed these actors to intervene in Sudanese society. One of the enduring features of a state such as Sudan has been the spread of this model to other portions of Sudanese society such as medicine, education and even increasingly policing and security. The bureaucracy’s ability to control entrance into these global networks has become a new source of power for an increasingly de-territorialized state.