

U.S. interests are the natural ally of the cause of Sudan

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

The following remarks were delivered by Mr. LaRouche to the Schiller Institute-sponsored conference entitled "Stop Dirty British Imperialist Operation Against Sudan," in Washington, D.C. on April 20.

The broadcast which I made on CBS television on Thursday evening [April 18], contains material which is relevant to the subject here, and which I will try not to duplicate in great detail, since the tape exists, and people, I presume, would have access to copies of it.

But, the point is this. Until the Fifteenth Century in Europe, in every part of the world, up to 95% of the population of every culture of every part of the world, lived in the condition of virtual human cattle, as slaves, as serfs, or, under the Aztecs, for example, in worse conditions than slavery or serfdom.

In this ancient time, a dominant form of society, extending out of the bowels of barbarism into feudal Europe, existed, which is imperialism.

Now, people use the word "imperialism" without understanding it. The British, for example, are not a "kingdom," they are not a "nation." The British Isles are not a "nation." They are a plantation. If you read the history of England and Britain, you will observe this to be the case. It's a place, a part of the real estate of the world which was taken over by a group of people who were organized by the Venetian financier oligarchy. When Venice had become extremely vulnerable, and could no longer play the imperial role that it played in the Mediterranean region during the middle of this millennium, it transferred, over a period of 200 years, it transferred the headquarters of Venetian banking, which was a copy of the kind of usury practiced by ancient Tyre, to London and to the Netherlands.

And, the Anglo-Dutch maritime region became the basis of an imperial power which was not of the feudal, landed aristocratic type, but, rather, of a banking type. That is, a financier oligarchy, which parasitized the entire world with usury, theft, slavery, and so forth.

An empire is not a people who have conquered other people, even though conquest of other people may have occurred.

An empire is ruled by a group of families, predominantly either of the landed aristocratic type of families, or the banking oligarchy, the financier oligarchy type. In ancient history and feudal history, the two types cohabited. But, you had, for example, Babylon, which is the model for all empire that we know in Middle Eastern and European civilization.

Empires in world history


The Babylonian model, or what was otherwise called the oligarchical model, is the predominant model of empire. In most cases, the empire was essentially based on the power of a landed aristocracy. However, in some cases, as in the case of Tyre, or the case of Venice, or the case of the Anglo-Dutch monarchy, the ruling power is not a landed aristocracy, a rural landed aristocracy, but a financier aristocracy, like the wealthy powerful families of the British oligarchy.

Now, these families have always chosen, whether of the financial oligarchy or landed oligarchy type, they have always chosen some group of people to be the "chosen people" for the oligarchy.

But, the chosen people don't rule. The oligarchy does. For example, in the case of the Babylonians: Babylon—both Babylon and the Persian Empire were controlled by a priesthood which came to be known in Greek times as *the Magi*. These were wealthy, powerful families who controlled the Babylonian Empire. At the time that Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar no longer functioned—as a matter of fact, they were almost as bad as the Windsors—the ruling oligarchy of Babylon said, "Let's get rid of these bums!" And they brought in the Medes.

But eventually, they brought in a group they had cultivated, called the Persians. And the Babylonian Empire was continued, and expanded, in the name of the Persian or Achaemenid Empire, which was nothing but the Babylonian Empire.

At a later time, we had the case of the Byzantine Empire. The Byzantine Empire was corrupt from the beginning, and it became more so as time passed. And, it began to crumble, out of its own corruption. It was depopulated through an environmentalist movement, started by a fellow called Diocletian,



Lyndon LaRouche addresses the conference. Seated are panel moderator Debra Freeman and Angelo Beda of Sudan.
 LaRouche: "The British say, 'Any nation which is part of the British Empire, can not escape without our permission! And we don't choose to let a nation as strategically significant as Sudan, escape, and become successful.' "

of limiting population. And, the population of the empire began to shrink, especially in the Greek-speaking area.

And so, at a certain point in time, the Osman Turks, Osman-led Turks, began to take over some of the real estate of the Byzantine Empire. And then, in the middle of the Fifteenth Century, Venice, for special reasons, worked together with the Osman dynasty, to turn over Constantinople to the Turks. And it became known as the "Ottoman Empire." But, it was really the Byzantine Empire, with all the same ruling families, essentially, with a few minor changes which had dominated the Byzantine Empire. The same crowd.

So, empires are actually always controlled by a group of powerful families, families which are sometimes in the model of the Greek gods of Olympos.

The nature of oligarchism

Now, the members of oligarchical families are not immortal. At least, I've never known of an immortal financier oligarchy, though some have lived much too long. But, nonetheless, the families tend to be perpetuated for long periods of time, in which members of the families function as *instruments* of the family, rather than the family as instruments of individuals. And these families form family-like dynasties, in finance, or in landed aristocracy, or in both. And these become *the ruling families of the empire*.

And, the families elect a boss from among them. They will either elect a doge, something like a doge, an elected monarch, as in the case of Venice, or some other arrangements

like that, or they will elect a family to hold the monarchy as a hereditary property. But, the ruling force is not the monarch. The ruling force is the oligarchy, which, as we see in the case of the "Dump the Windsors!" movement in Britain today, is an interchangeable part. It can be replaced, as has been done many times in history.

And, these oligarchies, then, with their chosen people, would then divide and conquer peoples of the planet. Large areas. They divided these areas into what were called *satrapies*, and would divide them, also, into smaller units, called "culturally semi-autonomous regions."

So, the method of empire is to have an imperial power, which is *absolute*, at the top. Imperial power is controlled by a group of powerful families, who are generally, also, *very evil*, who constitute an oligarchy. The oligarchy selects a form of political rule of the empire, finds a chosen people to act as the shock troops to aid the empire.

Take the case, for example, of Iraq. How did the Abbasid dynasty die? A bunch of loan sharks took over tax collecting. The loan sharks who bought the rights to do the tax farming, or the tax collecting, brought in some Seljuk Turks, as muscle, to steal land from the peasants. After a time, as the dynasty became more corrupt, the Seljuk Turks, who had been the agents of the collection agents for the tax gatherers, the private tax collectors, took over the joint, and changed its character. Which is the beginning of the Turkish culture in that region.

But, the families continued. The ruling families continued. The people changed, from Arabs to Seljuks, who became

the rulers, but the empire continued: this use of subject peoples.

Now, the subject peoples had no inherent rights. But empires were often prudent, and would generally shape their policies, so as not to offend too much the customary religion and other customs of their subject peoples. They would also play one people against another, on the issue of *religious difference, of ethnic differences, of imagined or real grievances*. And, by pitting one group of people against another,

But, what is it the British object to? They object to the idea that a strong, unified government of Nigeria would be an obstacle to the "interests of ethnicity." And, what is ethnicity? It's chopping up Nigeria into a lot of little parts which are supposed to begin shooting each other.

they would control them. And this system was used to perpetuate, in historic times, this condition, in which 95% of the people of every culture, of every part of the world, have lived *as human cattle*.

How to get rid of empire

Now, the subject of empire today is: How do we get rid of it? Which is the other side of: How do we create forms of society in which people are no longer treated as human cattle? In which every child that is born, is allowed to realize, through education and similar opportunities, through a quality of education, to realize that he or she is a person formed in the image of God, who, unlike the animals, has the power of reason; who can transmit ideas of principle and discovery from one generation to the next, through a Classical humanist mode of education; who can improve these discoveries, and transmit old and new discoveries to present and future generations, to the benefit of mankind, so that every person, in a sense, is a king within their society. They are a citizen, the highest rank of personality politically, in any of these societies. Some persons may have more authority, may have a higher function than others, but that should generally be based on talent or suitability, and so forth.

But there's no distinction of persons by class or by condition of servitude. That all are free, *by virtue of having a right to the knowledge which the entire human race has produced*. They can learn it, through education. They have the freedom to innovate, to apply this, to transmit this knowledge to others, and to have some institution called a government, a state,

which protects them in these rights, and which ensures that the good they contribute to society, will survive their lives. To ensure, as I said in the broadcast, that every human being has the right to live. That is, to be born, and to live out a span until the time they die, which should not be too soon. But, even when it comes late in years, it's short, against time.

We are small, and we live a short time. And, that gift of reason, to live in that short time, is, as the New Testament puts it, a *talent*, in the famous Parable of the Talents.

We have a talent, which is our life and our power of reason. And, our job is *to use* that talent. Not to waste it, not to throw it away, not to bury it, but to use it. *To enrich it*, by adding something useful to it with our lives. And to give that talent, which is our life, back to its giver, and to society, when we die. And, if we live so, then we can die with a smile on our face, because our life has been *necessary*.

And, the essential right of every person whom the struggle for society is aimed to benefit, the right is the right to die with a smile on their face in that way. To have lived a necessary life. And to have their family and friends *know* that they have lived a necessary life. To have lived a life which is also an example to others, to children, especially, where children can see that someone has lived a necessary life around them, which inspires them to do the same.

The empire says, "No." The British Empire says, "No."

The British Empire is very much alive

Now, the British Empire, today, is very much alive. The British Isles is a zoo. It is not a nation. The people of England, and so forth, have been so degraded, between Wilson and Thatcher, have been so degraded, that they've lost the capability of productive work, have almost lost the power of human speech, and are being degraded into a state which reminds us of the Yahoos in the final part of the story of *Gulliver's Travels*. Yahoos. They're poor, unfortunate people.

But, the empire which did this to them, is not the United Kingdom. It is the Commonwealth, the British Commonwealth. The British Commonwealth, which covers about one-fifth or more of the world's land area; which controls about 30% of the world's population; which controls about half of the world's financial turnover through London; which controls 65% of the world's precious metals; which controls about half of the international trade in petroleum, and related products; which controls the majority of the international trade in metals which are the so-called strategic metals, which are used for production in most countries; which controls food supplies, shrinking food supplies in international trade, in a world which is increasingly short of food, and in which famine condition are prevailing. In which the British, who control the food supplies, also have sufficient control over agriculture, as they tried to do in the case of Sudan, to *increase* the shortage of food. And, as they do in Egypt, by keeping Egypt's domestic food supplies to about 40% of the people's needs, to make the existence of the Egyptian government, *dependent upon*

pleasing the British every morning, so they get food for next month's feeding of their population.

This is a power not to be underestimated. The *worst* manifestation of this power, is in Africa, though you can also see it in the Middle East and other places.

In Africa, the British Empire, through the powerful countries which control the production of that area, and through the IMF, and through the World Bank, and through the London financial arrangements in cooperation with some Swiss banks and the Paris Club, has introduced a condition of *genocide* throughout Africa. So that, in Central Africa, even Museveni—who is nothing but a British agent, a totally controlled entity of Baroness Lynda Chalker, the British Colonial Secretary, now called the Overseas Development Ministry (you see, they can't even use words straight. They lie. It's the Colonial Administration, they call it the "Overseas Development Agency")—at a conference held in Uganda recently, described the collapse of the demographic characteristics of the populations of Central Africa. That through HIV, through famine, through other epidemic disease, and through a general *démontage* of economy, under conditions of World Bank and IMF and other stringencies, the economic conditions of holocaust have been imposed upon all of sub-Sahara Africa.

Three nations key to Africa

There are three nations in sub-Sahara Africa which are *key* to all of Africa. These are: Nigeria, the most populous nation of Africa. Second, Sudan, the largest nation of Africa; and, third, South Africa, which contains the largest single concentration of industrial resources, development resources.

If the British could destroy these three countries, which they would do if they destroyed the present regimes, through the results of the instability produced, then *all of Africa would be like a Nazi concentration camp, except in the respect that it were worse*. And, that is the condition the British wish to bring about.

The British oligarchy controls South Africa. The Oppenheimer, DeBeers, etc., etc. They control Nigeria, largely, through ITT and Royal Dutch Shell; and so forth and so on.

Some years ago, the present government of Sudan very much upset the British government and its clones, when, in a period of food shortage, the government of Sudan decided that it should have economic security in food for the nation. And the British said, "No." The IMF said, "No." The Bush administration said, "No." The Bush and Kissinger hangovers in the State Department said, "No." Agents of these characters in the Republican Party and some Democrats in the United States say, "No." And that is the "crime" of Sudan.

But the crime of Sudan is *not only* that it was determined to provide food supplies adequate for its own people, not to be in the position of Egypt, which, by IMF and U.S. and London diktat, is *not allowed to develop its own, independent*

food supplies, because that would mean the Egyptian government wouldn't be controlled from London any more.

But also, the worst thing of all: that Nigeria, without actually intending to do so, and Sudan, with a little more insight into the situation, for special historic reasons, are among the nations within the British Empire, i.e., the Commonwealth, which have decided that *they are not going to be controlled* as parts of the British Empire. That their people are going to be free.

And, the British tried to do some things, to square this away. They organized movements around the world, to destabilize Nigeria. What was the weapon the British used to destabilize Nigeria? What was their claim? What was the "oppression" which the Abacha regime was presumably imposing?

Now, remember that Nigeria is Nigeria. And people get into fights there lots of times. And they sometimes kill each other. It's not a peaceful country, in terms of its internal social disposition. You've got three principal religions, which is played upon by the British for all they can get out of that. Then, you have about 100 different ethnic groups, which each have historic conflicts, which the British, as colonial forces, did everything to promote, as they did throughout the rest of Africa. And the British are making trouble.

What the British object to


But, what is it the British object to? They object to the idea that a strong, unified government of Nigeria would be an obstacle to the "interests of ethnicity." And, what is ethnicity? It's chopping up Nigeria into a lot of little parts which are supposed to begin shooting each other.

The same thing in Sudan. Now, the government of Sudan, to its credit, has taken great efforts to find the road to peace with the people in the southern region of Sudan. But the British then pulled out an old fraud.

We have a fellow in Washington. His name is Ambrose Evans-Pritchard. He's a British intelligence agent, who works for the Hollinger Corporation, and is in Washington specifically deployed by the London *Telegraph*, which is a property of the Hollinger Corp., which is a branch of British intelligence founded in about 1938, Canada-based, which now controls a press empire. But, it's British intelligence.

Ambrose Evans-Pritchard is the virtual inventor of the so-called Whitewater scandal against Clinton, because these forces in Britain who are behind the Hollinger Corp. are the deadly enemies of the President of the United States. They would like to kill him. If they can't kill him, they want to defame him to the point of destroying him. Ambrose Evans-Pritchard is the scoundrel who does this sort of thing around Washington. There are others, but he's the chief one.

So, he had a father, another Evans-Pritchard. And the father is famous in northern Uganda, and in southern Sudan. Maybe not with the people of the region, but in the British annals. [With a British accent:] This is the gentleman who,



After a period of food shortages, the government of Sudan made a decision to achieve food self-sufficiency. That is the crime of Sudan in the eyes of the British Empire. An aerial view of Sudanese agriculture, and (inset) growing pineapples.

according to British doctrine, invented a nonexistent tribe, called “nilotic peoples.”

The purpose of that, was to create, on the border areas between Uganda and Sudan, and other areas, an element of instability, in which missionaries and British anthropologists would keep the pot stirring, and create a terrible mess. An instability which could then be used, not to benefit the people of that region (who come from many parts of the surrounding country, who just happen to all live in the same general region). Not to benefit them, not to give them any freedom and advantage. But to employ them, as a factor of destabilization. Partly against Kenya, significantly against Uganda, and, primarily, against Sudan.

You may recall, that earlier in this century, the British created, artificially, a situation in the southern part of Sudan, which was a hideous crime against humanity by the British. They did everything possible to separate the southern part of Sudan, from Sudan. And, one of the ways they did that, was to deny the people of this region, which the British like to call “nilotic peoples,” is to deny them access to development, access to freedom, access to escaping the conditions of barbarism. And, that was used as a pretext.

And now, at the present time, the situation in the south of Sudan, because of the wisdom shown by people in the present

government, in trying to find a peaceful road to a peaceful resolution in this area, through the federal and related programs, the area in the south of Sudan, despite all the arms that the British are sending in through the dictator of Uganda, Museveni, who was an ITT creation, who was the author of the genocide in Rwanda and Burundi—that poor Mr. Museveni, the agent of Lynda Chalker; she is said to love him dearly. I don’t know whether that’s a compliment to this gentleman or not. But, they can’t find the forces to conduct a credible war against Sudan through the southern region.

Pressure from Eritrea

So then, they turn to another resort, based on Eritrea. Now, Eritrea’s a mess. Eritrea was used, during former times, by the Soviets, as a point of destabilization against Ethiopia, at a time that Ethiopia, prior to 1975, was tied to the United States and Britain, and that Somalia was a primary client of the Soviet Union. And, the Soviets built this big naval base in Somalia. *Until*, under orders of British intelligence, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, in 1974-75, changed the rules. He met with the Soviets, and they swapped this client status of Somalia for Ethiopia. So, Ethiopia became the client of Russia, and then Somalia became the client-state of the United States and Britain. They swapped horses in 1975, which led to

a general war in the Horn of Africa, which destroyed Somalia; which virtually destroyed Ethiopia.

In the meantime, the Eritreans, who had been used by the Soviets, using the East Germans and Cubans to run the operation, had created a so-called anti-imperialist military force in Eritrea, which was deployed against Ethiopia. And, when the Soviets took over Ethiopia, as well as Eritrea, they had to calm it out.

But nonetheless, because of this history, and because of the presence of mercenaries, shall we say, from the former Cuban and Soviet and East German service in that area, it's a hot spot.

This is also an insert-point for use of hired mercenaries, who are drawn and recruited from the ranks of the so-called Afghan mujahideen, who are now based in the drug-trafficking centers of northern Pakistan. These people are the primary forces hired for international terrorist operations throughout the world, and most of the operations are run out of London offices. The British run most of the terrorism in Asia, at least southern Asia, and in Africa, northern Africa, and so forth. And, the mujahideen have become a major factor in running the terrorism.

So, the major vulnerability of Sudan today, has now shifted from the attacks through the south into Sudan, into attacks from the Red Sea, from Eritreans or Eritrean bases, and from Ethiopia, through Ethiopia. This was all done through a mujahideen hired attack deployed out of Pakistan, in a showboat hit-attack against the President of Egypt.

There was no attempt to kill him, contrary to the story. The President of Egypt travels in an armored car. What were used, were mujahideen, hired from Pakistan, who used AK-47s for the attack, which can not puncture a good armored car, a tank. If they had had a recoilless rifle, which the mujahideen are perfectly capable of using, or a grenade launcher of the right type, the car would have been blown up, and so would Mubarak. The purpose was to create an incident, to orchestrate politics in the context of the Adis Abeba conference, without actually killing Mubarak.

Then, they immediately turned around and demonstrated the purpose in two ways. First of all, I think somebody told—I would guess strongly—that somebody told Mubarak, “Look, we didn't kill you this time, but we'll kill you next. You'd better go with us on policy.”

I mean, that's the kind of attack that was. When that happens, you've been given a message in rather strong terms. And if somebody comes up and says, “You know, these guys could have *killed* you. They didn't want to kill you, they just wanted to give you a message.” He said, “What do they want!?” That's the way it happens.

All right. Remember, the Adis Abeba conference had on its agenda, with the support of the host country, Ethiopia, the attempt to cool out some of the conflicts. This was co-sponsored by the President of Kenya, who also had problems

with the British operations against Kenya through Uganda. And, what this attack did, was enable the British to orchestrate a reversal of this conference, and to launch a new wave of attacks on Sudan.

Competent regimes are not allowed

But, the attack on Sudan has, for me, two significances. First of all, there are nations which were part of the British Commonwealth, or which had been part of the Commonwealth, an empire, at some point. The British say, “Any nation which is part of the British Empire, can not escape without our permission! And we don't *choose* to let a nation as strategically significant on the Nile north-south way and in the Horn of Africa, as Sudan, escape! And become successful. If they will get an incompetent regime, we'll be glad to have that. They can have their independence. Because then they'll come running back to us, after they've had a taste of their own medicine.”

But a competent regime? No, not allowed.

And, that's the same case in Nigeria. There's an organic tendency in Nigeria, to use its natural resource revenues for the development of the country, in much the same direction, not, perhaps, in the same form, but a similar impulse, to that we saw in Iraq, before Desert Storm, when Iraq had independence. It was notable throughout the Middle East, especially for the way it poured its oil revenues, when not engaged in war, particularly, back into the development of its economy and its people. Iraqi youth had the best opportunities for education in the Middle East because of this policy.

The key to the development of Nigeria, is to keep a unified nation; to get these revenues, which can be had from various sources, efficiently going back into the country, into the development of the country's infrastructure, its opportunities. And, to create a unified nation *in fact*, out of the participation in successful development.

There's another aspect to this, which is important. The orders for this, come from the real British government. Now, the British Parliament is *not* the British government, except in name. It's sort of the kennelmaster for the inmates of the British Isles.

The real British government

The real British government, the British imperial government, is known as the *Privy Council*. And, the Privy Council, which consists of about 400 persons, is the person that makes laws *not only* for the British Isles; *not only* for countries such as Australia or Canada, of which the queen is the head of state, independently of any relationship she has to the United Kingdom. But also, in the Privy Council, laws are made, which govern, behind their back, the people of other nations of the Commonwealth. And, that is the *imperial agency* which represents the interest. They're the administrative bureaucracy, in effect, the highest level of administrative bureau-

cracy, for the 3,500 families, such as those behind Rio Tinto Zinc, British Petroleum, Royal Dutch Shell, ITT, and so forth, which are the real oligarchy of the British Empire.

So therefore, the attack on these nations—Nigeria and Sudan, and they've threatened to put a bullet in the head of Nelson Mandela, which would put all of South Africa into chaos—comes from these circles.

Where U.S. interests lie

Now, what's our interest here?

We have, in the United States, two interests, in fact, in the issue in Sudan in particular. First of all, it has proven itself a successful and viable nation, which wishes to assert its independence, as we, in our time, fought a war against the same enemy—as a matter of fact, we fought *several* wars against them—the same enemy, the British monarchy, for the same rights. It comes from a different cultural background, but one we can understand. It is struggling, with some success, given the circumstances, to improve the conditions of its people.

We wish to further that. It's in our interest to do it. It's in our interest to make the world free, because our freedom depends on the degree to which freedom prevails in the world. And if a nation is willing to struggle to build itself as a nation-state, in which it provides the opportunities of education and development to every part of its own people, we have to be for it.

On the other side, we have the interest in the fact the British Empire is *the enemy* of the United States. It is the evil empire, the real one. The one that Ronnie Reagan didn't understand. Communism's gone away, in a sense. But the evil empire is still here. Well, what was the evil empire, then? The one that's gone away, or the one that's still here, and was always there? The British Empire.

And therefore, to allow the British Empire to consolidate its power in the world, would mean the death of the United States itself.

Why? Look at what's happened to us.

Since April 12, 1945, the day that President Franklin Roosevelt died, an unfortunate, very low-level character by the name of Harry Truman, became President. Now, Harry Truman was completely controlled by an agent of the British monarchy. His name was Harriman, Averell Harriman. Harriman controlled the Truman government. Truman was a very small-minded man. He was the kind of fellow—you know. He represents the IQ problem I heard about, mentioned this morning: didn't have much of it.

But, the President, Roosevelt, had been determined, and had a great quarrel with Churchill during the war, over the fate of the world in the postwar period. And, the determination of President Roosevelt, that every part of the world which had been the subject of the British, the French, and the Dutch empires, was to be given their freedom at the close of the war in Europe and the Far East. And that the British Empire was to be dissolved, and the world was no

longer to be subject to British Eighteenth-Century, that is, Adam Smith and similar methods.

When Roosevelt died, Truman reversed all of that. And willfully, at least on orders from London, backed up the British Empire, backed up the French Empire, backed up the restitution of the Dutch Empire, imposed a financial and economic collapse on the United States, *unnecessarily*, and set up, with Churchill, in dividing the world into a bipolar nuclear conflict between two powers, the Soviet Union and the United States. *The British played both sides*. And that conflict between the two nuclear superpowers, the Soviet Union and the United States, dominated the fate of every nation in this world and every people, from 1946, approximately, especially from 1947-49, until 1989-91.

Every part of this world, as Kissinger reminded many developing nations. He said, "Policy is made in London, Moscow, and Washington. And, when those three superpowers agree, the rest of you will do as you're told. You have no

'Stop wearing the Union Jack for underwear'

The following exchange between Lyndon LaRouche and a member of the Sudanese opposition, took place at the Schiller Institute conference on April 20.

Q: My first question to Mr. Lyndon LaRouche: You are a Presidential candidate for the Democratic Party here, and I wonder if it conforms to your democratic values to support this military regime, which is trying to give itself the legitimacy by this fabricated kind of elections? If you commend this kind of regime, then you have to also support, if any other group of people come and capture the same power, and also try to recognize themselves by making this kind of elections. [Questioner cites various purported incidents of floggings and harassment; accuses regime of killing an opponent in detention, newspapers calling for *jihad*, etc.]. . . .

LaRouche: I'm going to make it fairly short, because there are a lot of these detailed cases which I'm not particularly up to, but I do know a few things about the whole situation. I know what my policy is based on.

First of all, these incidents are totally irrelevant to the basic question. Because the problem of Sudan, the problem of what the British call the "nilotic region" of southern Sudan and northern Uganda, the history of Uganda; who controls the dictator who is the President of Uganda, who is nothing but a thug for Lynda Chalker, in London; what

voice.” And that’s the basis on which the world was run. The IMF was a tool of that, the World Bank was a tool of that, and the United Nations Organization was a tool of that, always.

The U.N. as ‘the’ world government

After 1967, the time that U Thant announced the Second Development Decade U.N.O. policy, in which, actually, the language was a development policy, *there has been no development policy by the United Nations Organization or its affiliates in any part of the world.* There have been token projects, but *no serious effort* to develop those nations.

The nations of Central and South America, over the past quarter-century, have actually *devalued* from the higher level of economy which they had achieved back in the immediate postwar period, before 1967, into virtual lower Third World country status generally today. Oh yes, there are a few very rich people in these countries, as there are rich drug pushers in Lebanon, or what’s left of it, in the Hafez Assad colony

called Lebanon, from which Hafez Assad deploys terrorists against Israel, and Israel responds by killing Lebanese—but not Hafez Assad.

So, in 1989-91, when the Soviet Empire began to dissolve, the funny fellows in London, supported by “Mad Dog” George Bush in the United States, on British orders, which were articulated by Mrs. Margaret Thatcher and President François Mitterrand, one of her pet dogs in France, said that now that we have the former Soviet empire on the ground, let’s make sure that these nations never revive again. Let’s destroy them.

And, what they did, is they set into motion what was called a “reform.” The “reform” was the same kind of IMF conditionalities which the IMF tries to impose on Sudan and every other developing country, but a little stiffer than they usually do. As a result of that, every country in eastern Europe which came out from under the Warsaw Pact and Comecon, is now led by a Communist Party, which came soaring back

the British policy is, what it was back in the last century, what it was in this century, what it is today, I know very well. That anyone who perceives all kinds of problems in Sudan, of which Sudan has many. It’s a poor country. And, as we’ve heard, poor countries have problems. They *all have problems.*

We have poverty in the United States, and that’s a problem, too. But the point is, that when you talk about Sudan, *do not become trapped into*—as I will *never become trapped into*—*fallacy of composition.*

The problem in this region, *the entire problem in this region,* was created by the British imperial forces, who still control *everything.* They created the conditions. They are the ones that created the problem of the south.

They are the ones that created the genocide in Rwanda, and I know it. I know the present dictator of Uganda, under the direction of Lynda Chalker, who, together with Baroness Cox, is the organizer of most of these tales, or litany of tales, that come out of Sudan, of the so-called horror stories, or so-called victimization. I know *these people* are the criminals. And, someone who has not tracked the murderer, is trying to tell me that somebody’s pet dog has peed on somebody’s lawn!

The murderer is the British Empire and what it represents; and, we have a fellow in this country, called George “Mad Dog” Bush (who was formerly President, because we didn’t trust him with any other job, he was too incompetent for it), is also complicit in this.

But, these guys have committed *genocide*; we know what they’re up to, in terms against Sudan. We know why they’re doing what they’re doing against Sudan. We know what they’re trying to do to Kenya; what they did in Zaire;

what they’re doing in Burundi. What they did, together with the queen’s husband, through the World Wildlife Fund, in putting Ugandan troops, through the World Wildlife Fund, to penetrate Rwanda and set into motion this whole business. And, you had a bunch of people going into a Francophone country, who didn’t speak any French, but only English, and they called themselves “native troops.” It was done by this kind of crowd.

So therefore, *I know* what the problem is in Sudan, I know what some of the problems are that—the overall problem. I know what some of the efforts have been by the present government. I’ve been around in dealing in counterintelligence problems like this for a long time; and, I’m not easily taken in. There are major problems with Sudan, but I have not found any problem I perceive, that the Sudan government hasn’t told me about beforehand, and told me about many things I didn’t know. Yes, it’s a poor country.

So, I’m defending a country which is being attacked. And, I think it’s a mistake for people who may have good talent, to waste it in becoming propaganda agents for Adolf Hitler, which is what you do when you find reasons to attack Sudan. If you attack Adolf Hitler, then you might have some right to attack what the Jews did wrong. But, when Adolf Hitler, in the case of the British Empire, is killing off all the Sudanese, and is trying to kill so many nations on this planet, and has *done it* so often, by these methods, and I find the Sudanese complaining about the British doing the same thing, I’m on the—I *know* that I’m right to support Sudan against the people who are lined up with the British.

First thing you have to do, if you want to get *my* attention, is stop wearing the Union Jack for underwear.

into popularity because of what the British and the United States, and U.N.O. and IMF, had done to that country. The same process is in place inside parts of the former Soviet Union, such as Russia itself, out of *hatred* of what is done to it.

In the meantime, through Desert Storm, one of the greatest criminal acts ever perpetrated by any combination of nations in modern history, the U.N.O. became, in the minds of many people, including Mrs. Thatcher's government, and George Bush, and, of course, the British House of Lords, and the Privy Council, became *the* world government.

In that period, Chatham House, which is the British Foreign Service's policymaking think-tank, began to put out policy studies which talked about the breakup of China, the breakup of Nigeria, the breakup of various parts of Africa, new wars in the Middle East, and the breakup of a whole group of nations, from India and Sri Lanka, up in an arc through Turkey, and down through the Horn of Africa, once again, which had been called the Bernard Lewis Plan, named after a fellow who served under Glubb Pasha, in the British Arab Bureau, who designed this policy. And they said, "The United Nations is now *the* world government."

The reconstituted British Empire

The British said, "Fine. We're going to destroy the pretense of having a nation-state in the British Isles *anyway*. What we're going to do, is to reconstitute, through the Privy Council, the British Commonwealth as *the* revived British Empire. We are going to use the facilities and influence of the British Commonwealth, and the votes it controls within the United Nations, and through other stooges and clowns that we have working for us inside the United Nations, and, through the organization of totally unelected, unrepresentative, and no-good organizations called NGOs, we're going to take over the United Nations, and the United Nations will be the new disguise, under British imperial leadership, for *the* world government. *The* empire, which reduces every major power of this planet to merely a satrapy of an empire on the Babylonian model. An empire which turns the clock of history back to no later, really, than the Fourteenth Century, in terms of the level of economy and statecraft in the world. And which, in reducing the population, reduces the population potential. Which means that whole sections of this planet have a very large surplus population."

The number one area of the world on the target list for mass depopulation, i.e., genocide, is Africa. The genocide in Africa comes out of the British monarchy. It is largely coordinated, since 1961, by Prince Philip and that Nazi SS veteran, Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands, who founded it in 1961. Which expresses the same philosophy that Bernhard knew, when he was a Nazi SS member. And these guys are out to create the greatest genocide in history, in Africa.

Anyone who develops, as is quite feasible, given the resources, land area, and what technology can do, who seeks to develop strong nation-states in Africa, to bring together the

people based on principles of human rights, the ones I've indicated: the right not to be human cattle; the education; opportunities for technological development; the right to be a citizen; the right to have the kind of government which is totally sovereign, in which one can participate as a citizen, and have representation, and voice, as well as representation. Those kinds of nations, committed to developing Africa, *can readily succeed*, if they are allowed to do so. And that's the interest.

We must destroy the United Nations

We must defend the United States' sovereignty. To defend the sovereignty of the United States, we in the United States must destroy the United Nations Organization, as an attempted world government. We must defend and ally with all of those who are under the threat of death and genocide from the people behind the proposition of making the United Nations *the* world government, or continuing that arrangement. We have to be on the side of all of those who wish to create nation-states, who demonstrate that they are concerned to afford *the rights* of citizenship to all peoples within that nation-state, and so forth and so on.

Those are the issues. The issue is not, "Who shot whom in Sudan on what day?" Or, "Who punched whom?" God knows. If you say, who punched whom in Nigeria on any given day, the whole place would blow up. We can't have that.

So, those issues are not important. They may have significance for simple civil justice on the state level. They may be legitimate human rights concerns, which ought to be addressed in those terms.

But, *we can not have* people allying with the enemy of humanity, the British Empire, against people struggling for freedom and national sovereignty. We can not have people allying with the no-good organizations of the United Nations Organization against the vital interests of those nations, including the United States itself, which is determined to maintain the principle of national sovereignty on this planet.

And therefore, in this fight, the vital interests of the United States are the *natural ally* of the cause of Sudan, in Sudan's fight against its British oppressor. And, our job is to cooperate with the people of Sudan—which I think is a beautiful country. I've just been there shortly, but there are many qualities of beauty in that country. And I'm pleased with the fact that the federal effort has been made—is to help people in Sudan achieve what they set out to achieve. *It's in our interest.*

It's in our interest here in the United States. It's in the interest of every nation, of every people on this planet, that wishes these rights and security for themselves. It's in the interest of every nation in Africa, which does not want to be subjected to the kind of genocide which we're seeing ongoing in the decline of the adult life-expectancy from the range of 50 years down to 40 throughout Central Africa, and is going further.

So, that's where I think we stand. And that's what, to me, the issue is.