
Interview: Dr. Ghazi Salahuddin Attabani

Foreign invasion is designed to wreck Sudan's internal peace initiative

Dr. Ghazi is the Secretary General of the National Congress in Sudan. The interview was conducted by our Wiesbaden office, in early February.

EIR: We understand that the invasion of Jan. 12, was mounted by Ethiopian and Eritrean troops, accompanied by a handful of guerrillas from the Sudanese Peoples Liberation Army (SPLA). Who was behind the invasion, and why was it started at this point in time?

Dr. Ghazi: Anthony Lake, the national security adviser to the U.S. President, expounded the "Sudan policy" of the U.S. government in a public lecture in March 1995. He explicitly pointed out that the U.S. government would harass the Sudan through some of its neighbors; Ethiopia, Eritrea, and Uganda are the biggest recipients of U.S. and European aid in sub-Saharan Africa. No wonder, therefore, that they took it upon themselves to implement those vows made by Mr. Lake.

Sudan does not rank very high in U.S. priorities. It therefore remains susceptible to the vagaries of gambler-politicians and policy proposers in Washington who, in turn, are influenced by a host of interests not truly representative of the American nation.

The invasion was carried out at this particular point in time to scuttle the internal peace process, which had started to bear fruit.

EIR: How do you relate the invasion of Sudan, with the operations, out of Uganda and Rwanda, against Zaire?

Dr. Ghazi: For the past 200 years, Africa has served as the guinea pig for experimenters of the world order. Now a new world order is being shaped; in so doing, new borders are being drawn to suit the new plans. The handiest place to do this is Africa, for it had not known official borders or nation-states until the colonizers arbitrarily drew the present "illogical" borders defining spheres of Anglophone and Franco-phone influence.

The most delicate, and one of the richest regions in Africa, is the lakes region, containing the aforementioned countries, in addition to Burundi. These also constitute four of the nine riparian countries of the River Nile, which adds a Mideastern dimension to the question.

Although our adversaries painstakingly deny any intention to partition the Sudan by nibbling away its southern part,

we know that the new colonialist plans would not be complete without exactly that. The major stooge in the "lakes region" part of the plan is Yoweri Museveni of Uganda, a Marxist-turned-pro-imperialist after he was orphaned by the collapse of the Soviet empire. The minor stooges are the Eritrean and Ethiopian regimes.

EIR: The leaders of Ethiopia, Eritrea, and Uganda seem to be clearly aware of what they are doing and for whom. Statements by Yoweri Museveni, to the *Financial Times*, for example, document this. But what is the reality inside these countries? How are their populations responding to their launching aggressive war?

Dr. Ghazi: The populations of those countries are eyeing the actions of their rulers with suspicion and confusion. They know for certain that their real interests lie in maintaining peace and cooperation with the Sudan. The Ethiopians and Eritreans, in particular, realize from historical experience that war with Sudan can only bring devastation to their countries and the region at large. Also, they know from experience that, by being constructive and cooperative, they can bring about prosperity to the whole region. They are confused, therefore, about whose interests are being served while their governments maintain a hostile, rather than a friendly posture toward the Sudan.

EIR: The National Democratic Alliance (NDA) moved to Asmara, to set up the operations which we are now witnessing, in collaboration with John Garang and the SPLA, The political opposition leader of the Umma party, Sadiq al Mahdi, has been calling for an "uprising" in Khartoum, but some press correspondents on the scene, have reported that there is no hint of any such insurrection. Sadiq al Mahdi himself is travelling through the Persian Gulf. What do you make of this?

Dr. Ghazi: Sadiq al Mahdi is a false prophet of democracy. What many people fail to see is that, despite the great clamor about democracy, he is defining his own legitimacy as derived from heredity rather than free democratic elections. [Sadiq al Mahdi is the grandson of the "Great Mahdi," spiritual and political leader of Sudan in the 19th century—ed.] He presides over a party which has never experienced democracy within itself.



Dr. Ghazi Salahuddin Attabani meets with the LaRouche delegation, during a visit to Sudan in December 1996. From left: Helga Zepp LaRouche, Lyndon LaRouche, Dr. Ghazi Salahuddin Attabani, Muriel Mirak Weissbach, and Dr. Abu Dakr Shingeti, from the office of the President of the Republic of Sudan.

Despite their diametrically opposed origins, Sadiq al Mahdi and John Garang share a trait common to many Third World politicians. John Garang, who presented himself to the world through a Marxist manifesto, now poses as a devout Christian crusader when in the West, but as a keen Arab nationalist, when in the Arab world. He even recently formed an Islamic council in order to begin marketing himself in the Islamic world. Likewise, Sadiq al Mahdi is an ardent democracy activist when in the West, is an ultra-conservative, traditional Arab politician when in Arab countries, and is a ferocious fundamentalist, invoking all the legacy of the Great Mahdi, when in the Sudan. What we are watching now, is Sadiq al Mahdi on a spree to solicit support and money from some Arab states. When recently in Kuwait, he poured abuse on the Iranians and the Iraqis, the very countries he staunchly supported and heaped praise on when he was in power.

Sadiq al Mahdi is out of touch with reality. He thought an uprising would take place in Khartoum in his support; however, what is happening now is a true uprising against him.

EIR: The office of Baroness Caroline Cox, the deputy speaker of Britain's House of Lords, has stated, that this war should be seen as a "paradigm" for the kind of "clash of civilizations" that Samuel Huntington promotes. Cox's aide has been quoted saying that Arab and Muslim states would line up in support of Sudan, whereas African states would oppose it. What is the reality of the situation?

Dr. Ghazi: I have not read that statement, but I would have expected it from the likes of Cox. It is the same old doctrine of "divide and conquer," isn't it? In the last century, it was Gordon Pasha and Kitchener Pasha with their devastating Maxim guns, and now it is Baroness Cox with her dubious

organization [Christian Solidarity International]. It should surprise no one to find out that Africa—the guinea pig of the new world order—is being turned to for "paradigms" and "models" to experiment with.

EIR: How can this aggression be ended? There is an initiative passed in the German Parliament, calling for the German government to intervene, to promote a negotiated solution. A group of U.S. elected officials, who conducted a fact-finding tour of Sudan last September, has endorsed the initiative, and urged the United States to promote peace. The resolution talks about the Inter-Governmental Authority on Drought and Development (IGGAD) process, and the "friends of IGGAD." What is your view?

Dr. Ghazi: These initiatives represent a break with the traditional policies of many Western governments, hence they are welcomed by us. I hope that more initiatives will be made which will create a new momentum for peace in the Sudan. We are aware of the regional and international influences on the problem of southern Sudan. Hitherto, these influences have been negative. Any positive influence provides a bonus for the peace process.

EIR: What will happen if the aggression is not ended?

Dr. Ghazi: Sudan has a great capacity for endurance. We know that we can not appeal to the wisdom of the promoters of this aggression, because their ultimate goal is to redraw the African borders, as I mentioned earlier, and the best way to achieve this is through such aggression. However, we are confident that we have the ability to push back the aggressors and turn their apparent success into failure and a political liability, something which we have already started to achieve.