

In War-Torn Sudan, Washington and its Proxies Foment Extreme Violence

This transcript may not be 100% accurate due to audio quality or other factors.

Das Transkript gibt möglicherweise aufgrund der Tonqualität oder anderer Faktoren den ursprünglichen Inhalt nicht wortgenau wieder.

Dimitri Lascaris (DL): Good day, this is Dimitri Lascaris coming to you from Montreal, Canada on November 8th, 2025 for Reason2Resist. In 2007, in a now famous interview on Democracy Now, US General Wesley Clark, the former Supreme Allied Commander of NATO, revealed plans within the US government and military for waging war on seven countries in the Arab and Muslim world. Here's what General Clark said at the time.

Wesley Clark: About ten days after 9/11, I went through the Pentagon and I saw Secretary Rumsfeld and Deputy Secretary Wolfowitz. I went downstairs just to say hello to some of the people on the Joint Staff who used to work for me and one of the generals called me and he said: "Sir, you've got to come in and talk to me a second." I said: "Well, you're too busy." He said: "No, no." He says: "We've made the decision, we're going to war with Iraq." This was on or about the 20th of September. I say: "We are going war with Iraq? Why?" He said: "I don't know. I guess they don't what else to do." So I said: "Well, did they find some information connecting Saddam to al-Qaeda?" He said: "No, no. There's nothing new that way. They just made the decision to go to war with Iraq." He said: "I guess it's like we don't know what to do about terrorists, but we've got a good military and we can take down governments. And I guess if the only tool you have is a hammer, every problem has to look like a nail." So I came back to see him a few weeks later and by that time we were bombing in Afghanistan. I said: "Are we still going to war with Iraq?" And he said: "Oh, it's worse than that." He reached over on his desk, he picked up a piece of paper, and he said: "I just got this down from upstairs," meaning the Secretary of Defence's office today, and he said: "This

is a memo that describes how we're going to take out seven countries in five years. Starting with Iraq and then Syria, Lebanon, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, and finishing off Iran."

DL: Now, over the years, this much-discussed interview has focused upon the US aggressions against Iraq, Iran, Syria and Libya. What has been less discussed is that one of the seven countries that General Clark identified in that excerpt was Sudan. In recent weeks, horrifying reports have emerged from this devastated country in the northeast of Africa, home to an estimated population of some 50 million people. Sudan is suffering through its third civil war since it gained independence in 1956. The first lasted 17 years from 1954 to 1972. The second lasted even longer, 22 years from 1983 to 2005. And the third is said to have begun in April 2023 and is ongoing. On top of all this, Sudan has endured about 20 coup attempts and prolonged military rule since gaining independence almost 70 years ago. Figures recently released by the UN's Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs reveals the scale of the horror. And here you can see a graphic that was recently published by the OHCA. And just to highlight some of the terrible figures in this graphic, on the right side, underneath the map of Sudan, you'll see hunger and malnutrition. 24.6 million people face high levels of acute food insecurity and famine confirmed in five locations. Cases of children under five years and pregnant and breastfeeding women in need of treatment for acute malnutrition in 2025: 3.7 million. And 637,000 people currently face catastrophic food insecurity. And if you look underneath in the bottom third of this chart, women and girls in particular suffer abuses, including horrific conflict-related sexual violence. Some 12.6 million people are estimated to have been displaced since April 2023. This is larger than the population of many countries. Some 8.86 million people have been internally displaced in Sudan since that same month, April 2023, and it goes on.

So the situation there is truly of disastrous proportions. And we have been requested numerous times by members of our audience to investigate what is happening in Sudan. And we've answered the call today. We'll be getting a series of reports on the devastated country. The current civil war has drawn an increase in attention from the international community due to numerous reports that fighters of the RSF, or Rapid Support Forces have committed heinous atrocities in and around the city of El Fashar, a city of about 1.5 million in the Darfur region of the country. The RSF is a paramilitary force that is fighting the Sudan Armed Forces for control. And there's compelling evidence that the RSF has been supported and armed by the United Arab Emirates. In order to explore all of this, we have invited onto Reason2Resist Dr. Osman Noreldin, and let's bring him into the studio now. Thank you very much for joining us today, Dr. Noreldin Is a mathematical scientist and a Sudanese political activist. And I understand you're joining us today from the UK, is that correct, Dr. Noreldin?

Dr. Osman Noreldin (ON): No, from South Africa.

DL: Ah, from South Africa. And actually I think you lecture at a university there. Is that correct?

ON: Yes.

DL: Although the area of your academic expertise is mathematics, you've become a prolific proponent of peace for the country of Sudan. So I'd like to get into it with you today by beginning our discussion around this revelation of General Wesley Clark back in 2007. And as I mentioned at the outset at the oft discussed interview highlighted seven countries and one of them was Sudan. And typically when we see so much violence over such a prolonged period in a country of the Global South, it is largely due to foreign actors seeking to plunder as much of the country's natural wealth as they can get away with. Why would the US military, in your opinion, have set its sights on Sudan back in the early 2000s. Do you think it has something to do with the country's natural resource wealth? And if so, what are those resources that would attract this kind of attention?

ON: Thank you, thank you, Dimitri. Thank you for having me. And also thank you for the listeners. Well, that is a very important question and it goes back to before the 2000s. So as we remember during the Nimeiry era, the United States of America has an oil company; Chevron already started exploring the oil in the area in Sudan, which is in the Kurdufan region called Muglat, Muglat basin. So Sudan was already in the strategic significance of the United States because of its locations and also its growing oil potentials and of course the political alliance of whoever controlled the area in Sudan. But things dramatically shifted in the early 90s when the Muslim Brotherhood took over the power from a short-term and democratic period, violently. And in that time, the Khartoum regime under the Muslim Brotherhood regime was established; a very close tie with the international Islamic movement. And also Osama bin Laden was hosted there and also the same for several years. And during that period, what's called al-Qaeda, which bombed the USA embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. So in response to that, the USA also suspended the relationship and imposed sanctions on the government of the former regimes. And that measurement was, of course, to sanction the regime, but the consequence is that it is deeply affecting the people of Sudan, and we have been affected with all those sanctions until after revolution, after we overthrew the al-Bashir regime. And we had the transitional government, that transitional government worked very tirelessly to remove the name of Sudan from the list of the terrorist states that the USA put it on, and we worked very tirelessly and also paid the USA, we paid approximately 300 million USA dollars to remove the name of Sudan. And so the relationship between Sudan and the USA is I think because of the geopolitics and also the Red Sea in Sudan, the Red Sea regions, and also, the USA feel that there's some dangers that are coming from the former Islamic regimes in Sudan and also their network that they have, so that's what they think how they are aligned with things.

DL: So al-Bashir was viewed, if I understand you correctly, al-Bashir, was viewed unfavourably by Western governments, viewed as being a state sponsor of terrorism.

ON: Yes.

DL: My understanding is he was overthrown in, was it 2019, and that he's currently in a prison in Sudan?

ON: Yeah, he was in prison, but recently, after the war broke out, he left the prison. And they are still under the military – that is the government in Port Sudan. So, but they are the ones who are controlling this war from the ground. They are fueling it. Because even the RSF that we are going to talk about later, it was founded by al-Bashir because he tried to weaken the military and create militias. And one of those militias was the RSF, created during the al-Bashir regime. So now when they are fighting each other now, he is under the military leadership. He's somewhere there in Sudan. He's hiding but still trying to fuel the war from the ground.

DL: And he's been indicted by the International Criminal Court.

ON: Yes, yes, he's indicted by the Criminal Court. And he came here to South Africa in 2015, around 2015 and the South Africans wanted to hand him over but somehow he ran away and he's still on the move.

DL: So who is in control of the capital now, Dr. Noreldin?

ON: The capital is currently under control of the army. It was under control of the Rapid Support Forces. But the army pushed the Rapid Support Forces out and the Rapid Support Forces ran to the western side, which is Darfur and Kordofan, some part of Kordofan and some regions almost that far. So currently, the army controls Khartoum. But even that is not the same because a lot of the infrastructure has been destroyed and life for people is not easy, and there are a lot of diseases, hospitals are not functioning. So they are still controlling from Port Sudan, not from the capital, even though they are controlling the capital city, but they are governing from Port Sudan.

DL: And so before we get to the Rapid Support Forces, we are going to be discussing that. Are there any foreign actors supporting the Sudanese Armed Forces and who are they?

ON: Look, this is very complicated, you know, definitely, definitely they are foreign actors who are supporting both sides. And this support, so the people who are involved in Quad itself, they are supporting both sides. The evidence is clear, but there's a complicity in that support. So based on some of them, they have their security or international interest, some of them a geopolitical interest, with the Red Sea, the goals, the resources. The negative fueling is very complicated. And you can pick a name, you know, Egypt.

DL: I'm sorry to interrupt. I just want to clarify one thing. You said the Quad. Is that correct?

ON: Yeah, Quad.

DL: And what countries make up the Quad?

ON: The Quad is made by the USA, Egypt, United Arab Emirates, and Saudi Arabia.

DL: And Saudi Arabia.

ON: Yeah, Saudi Arabia.

DL: And so it's your opinion that that collection of countries – which is basic, all of them are, I mean, you may or may not agree with this, but all of the three regional countries you mentioned are effectively vassals of Washington.

ON: Definitely, some of them are involved in fueling the war. But the statement that they came together, you know, it's out of negotiation between them. So the statement is positive for us, as a Sudanese, is positive, pushing the two parties to come to the negotiation table and the ceasefire and open the humanitarian corridors, that's what we are looking for. So I think their statement is positive if they're willing to end the war.

DL: But if in fact they are supporting both sides, and that sounds to me as though they feel that their interests are best served if there is chaos and instability in Sudan, do you think that that's the case? They view it as being in their interest for the country to remain divided and in a state of chaos?

ON: I know they are fueling, you know, they're afraid of clearly supporting one side and indicate that this country or that foreign supporting this. They are afraid of the fragmentations. Because Sudan is very diverse. If it is divided, it's not going to be divided only in two. Because currently the RSF also has a lot of militias and the SAF itself has a lot of militia that are working with them. So the division I don't think that it's going to be a part of their solutions. It could be, but mostly for someone who's interested in resources, I think some of them may have in mind that they want to see their interest when there is the civilian government. Like the United States for now, the way they see it, they want it, but they want their interest under some civilian leadership. But currently, there are definitely a lot of people who are benefiting from the war.

DL: I mean, Sudan is, if it were completely unified, and it was led by a government reflective of the will of the people, a truly sovereign government, you know, given its geostrategic location, as you mentioned, it has a coastline on the Red Sea, and it has other resources, my understanding is simply not oil, it has gold, it has a very important agricultural land, and there may be other resources that I'm not mentioning, but I would imagine that the Americans would not want to see a unified Sudan that is truly sovereign and prosperous and pursuing policies that are reflective of the will of its people. Do you think that that's a fair statement, that they would not regard that as being in their interests? Which appears to be, their goal appears to be to dominate the entire region, that seems very much to be Washington School.

ON: To be honest, the Americans whenever there is a resource, they are there. Definitely, they will be there, and they will be having their influence. But for us now, what we see definitely they spread it. We don't know what is in the heart, but what they are spreading, they are spreading to end the war. They want a Sudan that is united. And that's what they're saying. They want to see Sudan united and definitely they want their security or control over the Red Sea. The Red Sea is where geopolitics come in. So the Red Sea is very important for them. I think their idea is, if Sudan is fragmented, there are going to be many militias, which they cannot control. If there are a lot of militias, there are a lot of foreign interests on the Red Sea. Russia is there, which is opposite to them. And China is there. Iran is there. For now, I

think for now, they want to solve this before it gets more complicated and more fragmented. That's what I see for now.

DL: Now, you mentioned a moment ago the ethnic diversity of the country. Could you talk to us about what are the major ethnic groups within the country, and to what extent has ethnic rivalry fueled this conflict?

ON: Look, that's a very interesting and a very complicated question in Sudan. There is also the common conception that people have in Sudan, when they see Sudan they're seeing the majority as Arab. And that is not true. Sudan is very diverse. There is the Arab, even though the official language in Sudan is Arabic, but Sudan is very diverse in terms of ethnicity. So the Arab descents are there, African descent are there. When you go to the north, up north, you see the Nubians. And within the Nubians, yes, they are one group, but inside that group, there are a lot of tribes, which are not Arab, the Nubians. And if you go to the east, Beja, they are also complex, and are not Arabs. You go to the south now, you see the Nuba in the Nuba mountain and South Kortofan. And when you go to Darfur, you see the Masalit, Zaghawa and many other groups, which are not Arab. So there is a complicity in that. Even though the colonial legacy, it creates inequality within the Sudanese society. And ethnicity is quite something that people hide behind it. Unfortunately during the al-Bashir regime when they came to power, the idea of this ethnicity, it becomes very high. They turn ethnicity into weapons. Firstly, they create, you know, during the al-Bashir time, for the first time for us, to your religions and your tribe, to be linked with the identity, if you want to get the identity, you need to write down your religion and your tribe. So they play around on that ethnicity and religions issue, create chaos, and weaponize and militarise tribes. And even the RSF itself forms the base of some tribes. So when the rebels started in Darfur to fight the al-Bashir regime, for justice, for equality of the resource, sharing the resource equally, they formed some tribes, divided the people in tribes, where some were of Arab descent and African descent. So RSF was based on that formation. So the ethnicity is there. Before that, we were very diverse people and we lived together. But what I'm hoping is that, and it was during the revolution that we came together as Sudanese, all the ethnicity joined hands. And there is a chance there to build a state that is based on equal citizenship, not regarding your ethnicity or your religions. But a lot of this foreign interference started from our revolutions. Our revolution has not succeeded because there are a lot of foreigners, our neighbours, in our regions, even in the Middle East. So our revolution did not succeed, but now in this war, ethnicity becomes a weapon. Because people are trying to create hate speech. So the hate speech becomes language or weapons to recruit people to take a side of one another, either the RSF or the side of the army.

DL: Now, you've talked about ethnicity, what about religion? Obviously, many of the people practise Islam in Sudan. What other significant religious groups are there in the country? And to what extent is religion fueling this conflict?

ON: Currently, religion is not fueling this conflict. There is a Christianity, but the majority are Muslims. We are Muslims. But the thing is, there is Muslims and there is the Muslim Brotherhood. These are two different things. I'm a Muslim, but I'm not a Muslim Brotherhood

who is practising the political ideology, you know? And that issue is a problem when the people want to practise Islam as a political ideology. And the majority of the Sudanese are Muslim. There is Christians, but they were a minority before the South Sudanese got independent from Sudan. Now, even now, currently, there are also Christians. And there are African religions also, especially when you go to the Nuba mountains, on the south side. You will even see African religions, practising African religions there. But the two main religions that Sudanese have is Christianity and Islam. And Islam is the top, if it's not 80%, 75% of the Sudanese are Muslims.

DL: And there are Muslims on both sides of this conflict on the RSF side and the Sudanese army?

ON: Definitely. Both of them are Muslims. When they are killing both of them they say Allahu Akbar and they take takbir to each other when they are killing which is very painful, you know, it's very painful. And that is not our Islam, that's not how we practise Islam. Islam is not a violent religion. So the way they are showing it is like Islam is a violence religion, which is not true. And there are some people that are assisting to see this kind of atrocity, these kinds of horrific actions saying this is the practice of Islam, which is not through.

DL: And I just want to echo, I think that's a very important observation – I myself become increasingly alarmed at the Islamophobia we're seeing in Western society – I just wanted to add as a footnote to what you've said, which is so important, you know, if we were to judge Christianity by the crimes that people who profess to be Christians have committed over the years, the only conclusion we could draw is that it is an intensely violent religion. So, for example, the people who came to what are now the Americas and wiped out the indigenous populations here, they professed to be Christian, and they tried many of them to forcibly convert indigenous peoples to Christianity. There were people who described themselves as Christians who founded and perpetuated the institution of slavery, the people committed genocide in Europe during the second world war profess to be Christian. So I could go on and on, I'm sure I don't need to tell you this. But this idea that because some people who are Muslims engage in acts of extreme violence, that means the religion is violent, is really ludicrous. So, I'd like to talk to you now about Al-Fashir, this city which is the current focus of international attention because of atrocities that are reportedly being committed there. Could you tell us about this city? What is its demographic makeup, broadly speaking, and based on what you've been able to glean from sources, reliable sources, what do you understand is happening there?

ON: The city where any horrific things or painful things that you can imagine are happening in that city and even now as we speak. And the atrocities that have happened recently are not only in Al-Fashir, there is a city called Barah, which is also not seen in the media, but Barah and Al-Fashir where there are a lot of atrocities being committed very recently. So the city of Al-Fashir, which is the capital of North Darfur, and my extended family is from there. And as we speak, I lost a lot of my family, extended family, and some of them are missing up to now. We don't know where they are and how they are because the communication is cut off. So before this war around the city, there are two very big internally [displaced] camps called

Zamzam and Abu Shouk. So those are full of externally displaced people during 2003 and up to 2006, 7, up to 11, even before the peace agreement that was signed in South Sudan, the Juba peace agreement. So that city is full of displaced people. So RSF, after being moved out of the capital Khartoum, is putting its eyes on that city because initially when the war started, most of the capitals on the western side had been taken over by RSF. Only Al-Fashir remained. So during the fighting between the army and the RSF in the south Darfur capital, which is Nyala, people flew to Al-Fashir. And in Al-Fashir, there is the military and also there are the rebellions. So now the military and the rebels, which is the Sudan Movement Armed Forces led by Minni Minnawi and also Gibril Ibrahim, which are the Justice and Freedom Forces, and all those who signed the peace agreement in Juba, most of them are there. So initially, they are not taking a side of one of the fighting, warring parties. After they took a side, RSF tried to get the city because the city was in the hands of Minni Minnawi, who is the governor of the Darfur region. So because of that, RSF for many attacks is attacking and seizing Al-Fashir until lastly, two examples, where they have managed to take the city. And unfortunately, and very sadly, when they took the city, they committed very terrible and horrific atrocities. They killed people, and even in groups, we saw a lot of atrocities that are coming from killing people, mass case killing of people coming because mostly those people are in that because they don't have options to move out of the city. Some of them are dying of hunger, famine, diseases, and there's a lot of injured people, there is no supply of medicines or no supply of military weapons to them. So the city is taken by the RSF. And up to now, the news that we are receiving, there are some people saying this: Yes, now it's safe; that's what RSF is claiming. They are saying that people can come back, but what we are hearing from the people who fled from Al-Fashir to the neighbouring surrounding area, called Tawila, it is a very small place, but now it's full of displaced people. And the position is very sad.

DL: First of all, I'm very sorry to hear about your loss, and really, my deepest condolences. It's terrible. I must say that you're able to speak as calmly as you can about this crisis in light of that is remarkable. So thank you for sharing that with us. Can you tell us why you think they're carrying out these massacres? Are they trying to ethnically cleanse the city? Do the perpetrators of these massacres view the people they're targeting as hostile to them? Is this purely vindictiveness? What do you think is motivating these mass killings?

ON: I think within RSF, it's quite complicated. Inside RSF there are some militia, militias who joined ethnically, you know, as an ethnic group. They believe that they can benefit from it. So what motivates them? They think they want to take revenge. That's my understanding. They want to take revenge because they believe that people should flee and left them to take the city a long time ago. But you know how many clashes happened between the army and the Rapid Support Forces there? It's more than 200. So when they come and find people, I think basically they want to take revenge and also the ethnic cleansing is also one of the things. Because most of the people inside that city are mostly from African descent. And when this recruitment started, most of them have been recruited on the army side. So they believed that, okay, you guys are here supporting the army and we took over, we're going to

let you know what supporting the army looks like. So based on that, I think they took revenge on the people.

DL: There have been reports that the RSF is being armed by the United Arab Emirates. Do you believe those reports are accurate? And if so, why do you think the UAE is arming the RSF?

ON: I think the reports on the UAE and the RSF issue, I think there is support. Definitely there is support. But why I think, because, as I told you, the foreign interventions for both sides they are competing over this: Firstly, there's a motivation of the gold as a resource is there. Secondly, the geopolitics of the Red Sea and also the Sudan, the landscape of Sudan; a lot of resources, for the agriculture's benefit. Whoever has the upper hand on whatever outcomes coming is going to be the one who has the right hand on that. I think that's one of the things that make most of the foreigners, not only UAE, the Egyptians are also doing the same. But these things are secret. So for us as the civilians, we don't want to, because we know how these guys have the power. And if we say you guys are doing this and so-and-so is doing this, UAE is doing that, well, our people are going to suffer there on the ground. So I think they must stop this negative interference and help us to end the war. And if there are any interests that all these countries have, they can negotiate or can be part of our foreign policies and our national interests. But the way they are fueling is very negative, all the foreign actors. And the result is that innocent Sudanese civilians are suffering.

DL: I just want to highlight Dr. Noreldin, a report that just came out in Canada; put it up on the screen here. This is an organisation, a wonderful organisation called Canadians for Justice and Peace in the Middle East. About eight days ago, they called for the Canadian government to stop sending weapons to the UAE because they say the UAE is fueling the genocide in Sudan. And I've highlighted here their report that armoured vehicles that are made in Canada by a company called Streit, S-T-R-E-I-T, and have been sent to the United Arab Emirates, or sold to them, have appeared in Sudan. Apparently they're being used by forces of the RSF and there's also reports of automatic weapons, rifles, provided by Canada to the UAE that have appeared in Sudan being used by the RSF. So Canadians out there who are watching us today, I just wanted to alert you to the fact that there is this campaign calling for the Canadian government to stop sending weapons to the UAE. And quite apart from what is happening in Sudan, which is horrible enough, the UAE is an egregious human rights violator, and there's no reason why Canada should be allowing weapons sales to that particular entity. Now, this brings me, Dr. Noreldin, to the question of Israel. You haven't mentioned Israel this far. Israel, of course, during these past two years of genocide has attacked seven or so countries in the region. And it obviously has a strong interest in what is happening in the Red Sea. Do you understand that Israel has played any role in this or that the policies of the US government towards Sudan are being influenced by Israel?

ON: Look, I think, Israel is quite busy with what is happening in Gaza. But definitely Israel has some links. And the very complicated thing is that the link is between both of them, both the warring parties. Both of them have a link with the Israelis, even though there is no clear evidence of it. We don't have clear evidence of these links. But I'm very sure that both sides

have a link with Israel. And if you remember, in 2019, al-Burhan, the current military leader who went to Uganda and met Netanyahu, and at the same time, there are some informations as saying that the second general of RSF, which is Abdul Rahim Dagalo, at some point also visit Tel Aviv, Israel. So I think both of them have links with Israel. So that makes it also complicated. That's why you see sometimes one of these party have like pull and a lot of over control, a lot of space, and then at some point, you see that like in the couple of months, the SAF, the Armed Forces was the one who was leading in the conflict and had the upper hand, pushing the RSF from a lot of cities, like in the central Al Jazirah and even the capital city itself, Khartoum, then pushed it to Kordofan and Darfur. And now, very recently, we see that the RSF is gaining power over the Armed Forces. So if you try to see this link, you definitely see the connections between these two warring parties and Israel. Definitely the link is there. But we don't know who's supporting who. But I can say, both of them have a good relationship with Netanyahu.

DL: And finally, what can we in the West do, those of us who want to bring an end to the bloodshed in Sudan and the suffering, what should we be telling our elected officials in the West to do?

ON: I think that's the most important and crucial one. The West and you can support the civilian effort. There are a lot of civilians now they are moving around saying that these both warring parties, they are on one side, which is the continuation of the war itself. And both of them are benefiting from the continuation of the war. And the civilians are saying no to this war from the beginning. And there's a lot of civilians. We have civil society, a resistant committee, political parties that are raising this to stop the war, immediate ceasefire and only political solutions for this conflict. Because if we have a ceasefire today, it's better than having tomorrow. Because the people who are paying the price are the civilians, are innocent civilians. So what we want from you guys is to pressure on your governments, to put pressure on those warring parties, not only one, not only focusing on the RSF because of their militia. They are militias, but now they are big and they also have foreigners who support them. On the other side, the Armed Forces, it's supposed to be the Sudanese Armed Forces. We call them SAF, right? But currently the name is not that one. During the al-Bashir regime, this military was politicised and most of the generals were involved in economics and also trading. So they are now also trying to create more militias and trying to take power benefiting their own, not the Sudanese. So what we want from the West as support, if they can put pressure on both warring parties and support the effort, that is calling for ending the war. That is why I say that Quad statement, the recent Quad statement is even though the people who have come with it are still there, some of them who are fueling the war, but it's good for us as Sudanese. We see something there because they are saying we need to end this war. We need to have humanitarian access for the people, we need to have a political dialogue for ending the war. So we need those types of support from the international, actually, especially the Western side. If they put pressure on both warring parties, RSF and the SAF, to come together at the table and reach a ceasefire today is going to be better. We save a lot of innocent people. We save a lot of displaced people internally. Now our people are asking: When is this going to end? People are tired from it, you know, we have a lot of diseases that

people forget about for a long time. There are types of disease, Dengue Fever, Cholera, and a lot of diseases, which you cannot even know about in the West. If I told you that we have Cholera, you may imagine what Cholera is, because a long time ago people forgot about Cholera. So because of this war and the continuation, we still have diseases that are killing our people. Not only disease, famine is killing, hunger is killing our people. So we need the support, we need the support that ends the war. We need the effort that supports the ending of the war, that's all what we ask from the Western side who have the power. They can talk to their leaders, those who have access to talk to their leaders, they can talk and assist us to stop the war. Stopping the war means not supplying weapons for both sides, not only one side. We need to target both sides if we want to end it.

DL: Now, you've mentioned a couple of times a statement. I think I found the statement you're referring to. This was issued on September 12th of this year by the Quad. Is this the statement you're referring to, Dr. Noreldin? It begins with Sudan sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity are essential for peace and stability? And then they say there's no viable military solution.

ON: Yes.

DL: And then they called on all parties to facilitate rapid, safe, and unhindered humanitarian access and assistance. And fourth, Sudan's future governance is for the Sudanese people to decide through an inclusive and transparent transition process. So that is, I assume, the statement you're referring to.

ON: Yes, definitely. Yeah, that's the statement I'm referring to, correct.

DL: One of the points that they call upon doesn't appear on the screen there; the fifth is external military support to the conflict parties in Sudan serves to intensify and prolong the conflict and contribute to regional instability. Accordingly, an end to external military support is essential to ending the conflict. So this is echoing precisely what you were just saying. We have to pressure our governments not to provide weapons to either side in the conflict. And before I let you go, Dr. Noreldin, I just want to remind people, if you found this interview to be informative, please like and share it, and please become a subscriber to Reason2Resist if you are not already one. We've seen indications in the past few weeks of efforts on social media to suppress our work even more than previously. So subscribing, liking, and sharing will help us to continue to reach a larger audience. Where can people find your work Dr. Noreldin? Is there some place where they can follow your commentary on these situations?

ON: Yeah, people can follow me on Twitter, on Facebook. Because like Google Scholar for mostly academic purposes. But in this activity of activism, people can follow me on my Facebook or Twitter, X.

DL: I'll put a link to your X-profile in the description of the video, so that way people can find you. Thank you very much, Dr. Noreldin, and I hope we can have you back on the programme as the situation unfolds in Sudan.

ON: Thank you. Thank you very much. I really appreciate you.

DL: Thank you. And we're coming to you from Montreal and South Africa today on November 8th, 2025.

END

Vielen Dank, dass Sie diese Abschrift gelesen haben. Bitte vergessen Sie nicht zu spenden, um unseren unabhängigen und gemeinnützigen Journalismus zu unterstützen:

BANKKONTO:

Kontoinhaber: acTVism München e.V.
Bank: GLS Bank
IBAN: DE89430609678224073600
BIC: GENODEM1GLS

PAYPAL:

E-Mail: PayPal@acTVism.org
g

PATREON:

<https://www.patreon.com/acTVism>
m

BETTERPLACE:

Link: [Klicken Sie hier](#)

Der Verein acTVism Munich e.V. ist ein gemeinnütziger, rechtsfähiger Verein. Der Verein verfolgt ausschließlich und unmittelbar gemeinnützige und mildtätige Zwecke. Spenden aus Deutschland sind steuerlich absetzbar.

Falls Sie eine Spendenbescheinigung benötigen, senden Sie uns bitte eine E-Mail an: info@acTVism.org
