

The Goal of the Sudanese Dialogue is to Entrench Colonialism

(Translated)

Al-Rayah Newspaper - Issue 621 - 14/10/2026

By: Ustadh Ibrahim Othman (Abu Khalil) *

During a press conference in Khartoum on Tuesday 29/9/2026, a member of the Sudanese Dialogue Committee, Nabil Adeeb, revealed that the dialogue's agenda will include fundamental issues, foremost among them the democratic system, the form of governance, Sudanese identity, Sudan's unity, and elections. Speaking about the system of governance, Adeeb stated that Sudan has undergone experiences that have shown, according to the committee's vision, that centralized rule does not serve the country's cause and linked it to the escalation of rebellions and civil wars, and the fragmentation of the state. He said that Sudan, given its diversity, can only be governed within a democratic framework.

These are the guiding principles of the Sudanese-Sudanese dialogue.

Before delving into the details of these guiding principles, we wish to emphasize an important fact: we have become accustomed to these regimes and their committees engaging in deception and doing the opposite of what is said. For example, the agreement to separate South Sudan was called a peace agreement, and now it is said that the dialogue is Sudanese-Sudanese. Yet, before the dialogue even begins, the solution is being sought from those who are not the people of Sudan—indeed, from the enemies of Sudan. News reports have indicated that the committee preparing for the Sudanese dialogue held a meeting on Thursday, 01/10/2026, with a group of ambassadors from European Union countries in Cairo. The meeting discussed the details of the committee's tasks and its extensive consultations with political and societal forces.

The question that arises forcefully is: what business do European Union ambassadors have with the Sudanese dialogue? Or are these ambassadors Sudanese and we are unaware?

As for the directives or agenda of the dialogue, as the committee termed them, we will discuss in detail the most important ones, namely: the democratic system and the form of government, Sudanese identity, and decentralized governance.

First: Democracy and the Form of Government

The committee makes democracy the basis of governance when it states that Sudan, given its diversity, can only be governed within a democratic framework. They say this as if we have been governed by a system other than it for seven decades! Since the English colonialist left with his armies, he left behind men whom he had carefully crafted to inherit the very democratic system he applied in our country, and this has persisted to this day, regardless of the changing forms and appearances. This is because the foundation of the democratic system is that the legislators are the rulers, whether they are civilians wearing jalabiyas and turbans, or wearing suits, or whether they are military men wearing military uniforms—there is no difference. All of them have governed the country with the systems of the disbelieving colonialist and have remained subordinate to him politically, economically, militarily, etc. Only the subservience changes from British to American, then British, then American, and so on... The result is that we remain colonized and subordinate, because an independent state is one that possesses its own decision-making and steers the reins of its affairs, and acts according to its own will. This is why Sudan has remained backward, lagging behind the ranks of developed states throughout these decades. We see countries that were colonized but are today major powers because they completely broke free from the yoke of colonialism; their decision-making is in their own hands, and they act according to their own will. For example, America was a colony of England, and when it liberated itself from it, it did not become a subordinate state; instead, it became an independent state and progressed until it became the leading state in the world today.

Another example is China, which was a colony of Japan, yet after its independence it did not become a subordinate state but rather an independent one. Today, it is among the five countries that possess the veto power in the UN Security Council.

In reality, democracy is an inherently contradictory idea, practically impossible to achieve. It claims that sovereignty belongs to the people and that they govern themselves—a deception and a lie. It is impossible for millions of people to gather and legislate laws, so the workaround is to

elect representatives who legislate on their behalf. Moreover, the people as a whole do not govern or manage state affairs; rather, those who actually govern are a specific elite who circulate power among themselves through electoral mechanisms predetermined by laws, funding, and media influence. The will of the people remains a slogan invoked when needed and ignored when it conflicts with the interests of the powerful. Reality testifies that even in the most democratic countries according to capitalists, it is they who are in control. The contemporary American philosopher Noam Chomsky has attested to this, arguing that democracy in the West, especially in America, is governed by a system of “manufacturing consent,” where media outlets and large corporations steer the minds of voters and shape their opinions to serve the ruling elites, rendering voting a mere formality.

This is the democracy that the Sudanese Dialogue Preparation Committee wants to make the basis of governance, despite it having been tried in our country for decades and proven its failure. So why do they want us to try what has already been tried? The Arabic proverb says, (تجريب المجرب ندامة) “Trying what has already been tried is regretful,” and the popular saying goes, (إلى يجرب المجرب عقله مخرب) “He who tries what has already been tried has a ruined mind.” This is from a practical standpoint. As for the Shariah perspective, it is a system of disbelief that contradicts our creed in both its foundations and branches. Instead of extracting us from this reality, they want to entrench it in service to their disbelieving colonialist masters.

Second: Identity and What Is Meant by Identity?

Without delving into terminology, identity means: who are we? And we in Sudan—our identity has been settled for hundreds of years; we are Muslims, whether we are Arabs or Africans, black or white. These descriptions have no bearing on identity. The strange thing is that they want to discuss identity even though they already discussed it during the Wadah Dialogue in 2014 and claimed they had settled it as being a national identity or a Sudanese identity! And they know full well that this talk is nonsense and misleading, intended to obscure our true identity, which is Islam. Islam is the melting pot in which all races and ethnicities have fused, not just in Sudan, but everywhere Islam has entered. Therefore, the aim of casting doubt on our identity and talking about discussing it in the Sudanese dialogue is to distance Islam from systems of governance, politics, and other spheres. And those who cast doubt on our identity are merely serving the policy of their masters.

Third: Decentralized Governance

The Dialogue Committee stated that centralized governance does not serve the country’s cause and linked it to rebellions, civil wars, and the fragmentation of the state. Here, too, is another deception, for there is no connection between centralized governance and rebellions or civil wars. Rebellion is linked to the objectives of the international conflict over Sudan. The first rebellion in Sudan was manufactured by the English, who ruled Sudan and implemented the policy of Closed Districts in its south with the aim of separating it. Moreover, the rebellion in the south began in 1955, i.e., before Britain’s departure, meaning that it was Britain that manufactured it for the purpose of separating the south. Then America took on the major role in this matter afterward when governance affairs fell to its agents, and it proceeded with Britain’s very plan until it succeeded in 2011 with the secession of South Sudan. As for the rebel movements in Darfur, they are, for the most part, British-backed movements that arose against America’s agents in the governance of Sudan.

Moreover, decentralized governance—whether federal or confederal—is fundamentally designed to be applied to states that wish to unite, not to a country that is already unified!! Applying such systems in our countries is intended solely for fragmentation and division; it is nothing but an old colonial policy, that of “divide and rule.”

However, in Islam, the system of governance is one of unity, while administration is decentralized, and there is a difference between governance and administration.

Just as these individuals work to entrench the policies of the disbelieving colonizer in our lands, there are men who labor tirelessly, dedicating their nights and days, to realize the Promise (وعد wa’d) of Allah (swt) and the glad tidings (بشرى bushra) of His Prophet (saw) by restoring it as a Khilafah Rashidah (rightly guided Caliphate) on the Method of the Prophethood.

*** Official Spokesman of Hizb ut Tahrir in Wilayah Sudan**