

## Sir George Bush: On Her Majesty's Service

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Dec. 24, 1996

British-led intelligence networks' role in supporting international terrorism against France, Sudan, Colombia, and, most recently, Peru, obliges all U.S. citizens who wish to regard themselves as patriots, rather than of a nasty Tory type, to come to their senses on the subject of those continuing services to the British Empire, for which, according to no less an authority than the Queen herself, President Sir George Bush has received a knighthood from her Royal Britannic Majesty.


We examine the present British campaign for UNO sanctions against Sudan, against the background of London's simultaneous backing for the same international terrorism of which it, with witting falsehood, accuses Sudan. We emphasize the relevance to this of France's and other nations' repeated exposures of London as the base for terrorist operations directed against them. We emphasize London's role in furthering the cause of international terrorism in Fidel Castro's Central and South America, as key to understanding the genocide and related terrorist operations which London is orchestrating through Uganda and poor Eritrea against Sudan, Rwanda, Burundi, and Zaire, among other targets in what Sir George Bush's cronies of genocidalist London currently identify as "the Greater Horn of Africa."

Refer to the attached documentation, as numbered here, for identification of evidence bearing upon that question. [See pp. 24-45.] There, (1) consider the role of Britain's George Soros in orchestrating November's pro-drug-legalization referenda through Republican Party channels in Arizona and in California; also, consider the included documentation, in that same location, of charges against Soros and his operations, which have been presented by official circles in Italy, and by President Tudjman, and his government, in Croatia. Combine

this with (2) French officials' repeated exposures of Britain's harboring of the most dangerous of the world's well-known international-terrorist organizations operating inside France. Consider additional evidence, from Israeli sources and elsewhere (3), corroborating this exposure of Britain's leading role behind international terrorism operating throughout most parts of the world, such as against Peru and elsewhere today. Take this together with Sir Henry Kissinger's public brag, in 1982 (4), that he had been an agent of the British foreign service at the time he was supposed to be serving U.S. Presidents Nixon and Ford. Add to this (5) recent revelations of the roles of former U.S. President Sir George Bush, as (a) former drug kingpin, (b) Moonie-cult lackey, and (c) as a director of Britain's Canada-based, Africa-genocide-linked, Barrick International interests.

The question is: How does one correctly identify the British intelligence agents operating within any given assembly of the world's so-called Very Important Persons (VIPs)? Very few among today's putative counterintelligence specialists have answered that question competently. Even in the instance they identify an actual such agent, their selections usually rely on methods which lead them more often to wrong identifications and interpretations than to correct ones.

For example, note, in attached documentation, although today's principal U.S. television networks were derived from British Empire interests' control of radio patents, the difference between (6) traditional fellow-travellers of the British services, such as *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*, and (7) the newspaper chains outrightly controlled in British imperial interest, by such British Commonwealth agencies as the Murdoch and Hollinger chains. Similarly, what is the Australian angle which U.S. Attorney General Janet Reno has been complicit in covering up in such cases as



*Lyndon LaRouche in Sudan, December 1996. "We examine the present British campaign for UNO sanctions against Sudan, against the background of London's simultaneous backing for the same international terrorism of which it, with witting falsehood, accuses Sudan." (For a report on LaRouche's visit in Khartoum, see p. 46.)*

the Waco, Texas massacre (8), and, also, in (9) the fraudulent 1983-88 covert operations and legal trials of a U.S. Democratic Presidential candidate whom Henry A. Kissinger and 1980s drug kingpin George Bush wished to put out of the way? What is the massive official, deliberate cover-up, for the benefit of not only both the British government and former President George Bush, but, also, ongoing international terrorism, in (10) the carefully pre-scrambled New York City Federal indictment, trial, and conviction of those accused in the World Trade Center bombing? What is the role of British intelligence's Hollinger press channels (11), in orchestrating the attempts to indict U.S. President Bill Clinton—i.e., overthrow the U.S. government in the same way British intelligence agencies customarily conduct bloody revolutions, invasions, or other forms of political coups against the governments of Third World nations?<sup>1</sup>

It is past time for the Federal government and ordinary citizens of the U.S.A. to come to their senses in these and closely related matters. Have we not already experienced international terrorism, and a top-down, politically motivated, judicial cover-up in the case of former Vice-President George Bush's Special Situation Group (SSG) assets, the (10) Afghan mujahideen, to provide color for the bombing of New York

City's World Trade Center? Are not the politically most sensitive aspects of the massacres at Waco, Texas and Ruby Ridge, Idaho (12) still covered up? Do we not witness the effort to explain away what is presented as a highly sophisticated, and relatively large-scale operation, the Oklahoma bombing (13), by suggesting the whole affair is to be blamed upon a convenient pair of scapegoats?

Look at the relevant lesson to be learned from certain among the undisputed, well-known facts in the case of the terrorist attack in Peru (14). Look at those facts; then, say similar terrorist attacks could not happen in the U.S.A. itself, even as early as sometime during 1997. The leading, implicit point is: the legitimate purpose in chasing individual termites, is to find, and destroy the nest from which they come.

### **How to kill a nation**

Consider the following, exemplary features of the matter, as drawn from the attached report (14) on the terrorist invasion and occupation of Japan's diplomatic premises in Lima, Peru.

In this case, the putative perpetrator is a branch of internationally organized narco-terrorism operating within Peru, the MRTA, which is otherwise to be recognized as the complement to the similarly connected, mass-murderous, nominally Communist narco-terrorist organization known as *Sendero Luminoso*. These two organizations represent, combined, international narco-terrorist gangs based in the area which is the largest single source of supply of illegal cocaine to the criminal markets of world; they are both criminal associations

1. Consider the manner the British Empire, through Colonial Office ("Overseas Development" office) Secretary Baroness Lynda Chalker, is steering, today, the highest rate of genocide in Twentieth-Century history, against literally millions of refugees from Rwanda and Burundi.

in the highest degree, which have already murdered tens of thousands of proverbial innocent bystanders, criminal associations whose mere toleration by any government would constitute a crime against humanity by that government. For years, Peru's President Fujimori led his nation's military and police forces in a successful campaign to break the power of, and to imprison these mass-murderous, narco-terrorist killers in his own country, a campaign for which all civilized humanity owes a great debt of gratitude to Peru, to its incumbent President, and to the military and police institutions of that nation.

Granted, as *EIR* and other experts agreed at the time when the majority of these terrorists had been rounded up, Peru had eradicated most of the branches, if not all of the seeds of these terrorist organizations; but, until recent foreign interference, from U.S.A. official channels, and elsewhere, pressed Peru to lessen its security measures against international terrorism, the terrorist menace in Peru remained essentially a dormant one.

These two Peru-linked terrorist organizations are part of a terrorist international called the São Paulo Forum (*Foro de São Paulo*) (15), nominally originating in Brazil, and presently headed, at least nominally, by Cuba's President Fidel Castro. This association includes every notable international terrorist organization operating to the south of the United States, and includes also agents operating, from within the Internet, inside the U.S.A. itself. The principal narco-terrorist organizations of Colombia, including the "legalized" M-19 and the FARC, are part of this. The terrorist organization which calls itself the "Zapatistas" (15), which has occupied one of the richest oil-deposits of Mexico, in the state of Chiapas, is part of this same terrorist international.

Some confused minds call these "leftists"; wicked people call them "rebels." History shows (16), that the "leftist" Duke of Orleans, "Philippe Egalité," the patron of terrorist Robespierre, and a terrorist mass-murderer in his own right, was, like Napoleon III after him, a British intelligence services' agent of influence against his own nation, France. The same history shows, that "leftist" terrorists Danton and Marat, were mass-murderers trained in, and directed from London by the then-head of the British foreign intelligence service, Lord Shelburne protégé Jeremy Bentham (16). The "leftists" of Fidel Castro's following among the terrorists of the São Paulo Forum, are in that tradition.

The London connection to the MRTA, like the House of Lords' openly expressed sympathy for the narco-terrorists of Colombia, shows us the meaning which the term "leftist" must invoke when employed as a political costuming for the class of international narco-terrorist organizations which the MRTA represents. Terming the MRTA "rebels," as their apparent sympathizers of the CNN network have done, is like terming genocidalist Genghis Khan "a specialist in etiquette."

That said, focus upon the specific kind of criminal complicity exhibited by certain press and related agencies in the

recent MRTA affair in Peru (17). Focus upon a collection of accomplices which includes the editorial page of the Dec. 24 *New York Times*, Time Warner's CNN network, and other traditionally London-connected news-media accomplices of these terrorists. These terrorists have been operating, like the assassins which British agent Giuseppe Mazzini's Young Europe deployed, or, as in the 1860s tradition of B'Nai B'Rith associate and British agent John Wilkes Booth: as instruments of British policy-shaping.

In this case, as the relevant international television news-media insisted constantly, the announced purpose of the recent MRTA terrorists' deployment, has been to induce Peru to abandon the last vestiges of national sovereignty, just as such shamelessly open sympathizers of Colombia's narco-democracy as the British House of Lords have insisted for Colombia, and the sympathizers of international terrorism's "Zapatistas" have used terrorists' deployment as a pretext for demanding the end of the national sovereignty of the Republic of Mexico.

Take CNN as typical of those parts of the international news media whose editorial policy in this matter clearly expresses culpable kinds of sympathetic actions in aid of at least some crucial features of the terrorists' crimes. From virtually the outset of the terrorist crime, CNN has insisted on terming the terrorists "rebels," and in acting as a de facto, Josef Goebbels-like propaganda ministry, in support of demands that the government of Peru must submit to the terms presented by the criminals. CNN went to such extremes, as suggesting that Cuba's Fidel Castro, the putative head of the relevant international terrorists' political association, might assist in such destruction of the national sovereignty of the people of Peru.

Are CNN reporters therefore to be described as "fellow-travellers of terrorism"? Was Nazi Propaganda Minister Josef Goebbels, perhaps, a "fellow-traveller" of the Gestapo? Cut through the shyster's quibbling sophistries about "politically correct" choice of words. Why should institutions which some putatively *chic* persons of reckless opinions wish to term "respectable," such as the Berlin-based *Chickie-Mickies* of CNN, or Britain's House of Lords, be gushing like yesterday's sex-maniacal bobby-soxers, over the fashionable international terrorists of Peru or Colombia? Granted, some CNN reporters might reject the idea of actually sleeping with an MRTA terrorist; let us give them the benefit of the doubt, by stating that it is irrelevant to this report whether they all do, or don't. The question is, whence the coincidence of desired ends between the operations of the actual terrorists and their putative political fellow-travellers among representatives of today's international mass media?

Is the answer really an elusive one? Are there not people in high places, in the U.S.A., as in western Europe, who think it desirable that the institutions of the modern, industrialized nation-state republic—such as the United States itself—must quickly fade away? Are there not presently currents of opin-

ion, in high places, working openly to eliminate the sovereignty of nation-states, even their own, in order to transfer power to supranational regimes, such as the UNO Security Council, the UNO's locust-plague of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), or regional agencies such as the European Union or Organization of the American States (OAS), before the close of the present century?

Might one not conceive of the possibility, that, late some November evening, in the year 2000, Al Gore rushes to inform his wife, Tipper, that he has just been elected President of the United States. To which news Tipper responds with mixed diffidence and pity, "I hate to tell you this, Al; but, the United States was dissolved eight months ago. They just forgot to call off the election."

It might not happen like that, but, around the world, there are a lot of people, including Britain's Prince Philip, the Duke of Edinburgh who has served as acting Queen termite of the World Wide Fund for Nature, including some obviously very influential, and also very treasonous persons and circles inside the U.S.A., who have been straining to bring that dissolution of the U.S.A. about, as soon as possible.

There are some people in the relatively highest positions of policy-shaping inside the U.S.A., who have been working to bring about the early dissolution of the sovereignty and present borders of every nation south of the U.S. borders. Many of them are associated with the relevant "Volpi di Misurata" of the old Kissinger State Department, Luigi Einaudi. During late 1995, this reporter, in his capacity as a candidate for the Democratic Party's 1996 U.S. Presidential nomination, had occasion to denounce precisely such a policy for the Americas issued by the now recently resigned U.S. Secretary of Defense Perry himself, a policy which called, point by point, for stripping the republics of the Americas of the most crucial institutions essential to the continuation of their national sovereignties.

The leading effects of the demands placed by the terrorists, were fully consistent with such stated goals of eliminating the national sovereignty of every present state within the Americas, the U.S.A. itself included. The most prominent of the demands, was that the government free from the prisons about 400 of the most inhuman mass-murderers and drug-pushers in the history of South America. The second, is that these terrorists and drug-pushers should be set up, with financing by the government of Peru, to be a "legalized" political organization, like the M-19 of Colombia's present "narco-democracy." What, then, if the MRTA's fellow-terrorists inside Brazil conduct a similar terrorist operation in the near future, or perhaps the allies of the Peru narco-terrorists' Zapatista allies in Mexico? Clearly, CNN and certain other international news-media organizations have no presently manifest objection to turning such mass-murderous, narco-terrorist organizations loose on the entire hemisphere.

Obviously, once one compares the demands of the terrorists with such international news media's expressions of sym-

pathy for those demands, only the most reckless of fools would deny the fact of political affinities between the terrorists and such news media. The next question posed by these recent events in Peru, is: What is the nature of the British connection to these terrorists, apart from the fact that not only has Britain's House of Lords expressed its warm regard for Colombia's narco-democracy, but the British government is openly, and officially harboring the largest of Peru's narco-terrorist organizations, *Sendero Luminoso*, as well as many other, similar organizations, in London. One might ask, without being rightly accused of profanity: "What in Hell has London become?"

## The British Empire

Persons who show themselves thus to be illiterate in the most elementary features of modern and also ancient history, insist that the mantle of imperial authority has passed entirely from the former British Empire to the United States of America. Such persons have frequently defended their delusion to this effect, by advancing the following sophistry. They are wont to assert (often with a telling glint of fanatical blindness in their wild-eyed stare at the unseen), that the poor, little United Kingdom whose economy has been recently almost destroyed by its baby-killing former nanny, Margaret Thatcher, must be viewed either as a mere lackey of the terrible U.S.A., or, at most, perhaps, a moderating influence upon the dumb U.S. strategic giant.

Those officials of governments who, thus akin to Jonathan Swift's fabled sages of Laputa, suffer the delusion, that the United Kingdom today is ruled by an elected Parliament, should not, in the interests of their own safety, be allowed out of the house without their vigilant, pig's-bladder-armed attendants. The widespread popular ignorance of the relevant facts must be corrected, if but summarily, here, if we are to bring the popular mind out of its imprisonment in popularized, illiterate virtual reality, into the world as it actually is.

Since the 1714 accession of King George I, the British Empire was established as an empire in fact, as a matter of law, under the implicit terms of the preceding Act of Settlement. In brief, the ruling financier oligarchy of London, acting in a manner copied from the precedent of the imperial maritime and financier power of Venice, selected, instead of an elected Doge, an hereditary, Welf (var., Guelph) monarchy.

Like all empires of note from earlier history, as far back as ancient Babylon, the ruling imperial house was the sole, ultimate authority in law, unless it were ousted by the oligarchy itself. This authority, for as long as it might be continued, is implicitly subject only to the monarchy's observance of certain religious and related local customs. These customs might evolve, in the sense that Immanuel Kant, G.W.F. Hegel, and Karl Savigny later set forth their respective doctrines of changing custom, as changes occurring under the influence of an utterly irrational *Volksgeist*, *Zeitgeist*, or *Weltgeist*, or merely "popular opinion"; but, the irrationalist principle of

custom was the only “constitutional” form of constraint imposed upon an imperial monarch acting as executive agent for the relevant oligarchy.

For the literate historian, there is nothing extraordinary in this British imperial arrangement. Throughout European and greater Mediterranean history, with the exception of some Greek city-state republics and their imitations, until the first modern nation-state was established, as 1461-1483 France under King Louis XI, the dominant political form of society and law, was the imperial form familiar to us from ancient Babylon, ancient Tyre, and the Persian, Ptolemaic, Roman, Byzantine, and Venetian empires. These empires were all ruled, top-down, on behalf of an oligarchical collection of families, an oligarchy of a form symbolized in the Greek Olympus pantheon. In that sense, the emperor, or pharaoh, or Cromwell-like dictator, whether an individually selected ruler, or a selection of an hereditary form of such rule, was the executive—the proverbial Zeus—which the oligarchy put over itself, as the chief *capo* of a U.S. collection of organized-crime “families,” such as the late Meyer Lansky, might acquire his position.

In the instance of the British Empire, the ruling oligarchy is constituted presently of several thousands persons drawn chiefly from those families which represent the financier interests associated with Commonwealth places such as the City of London, Montreal, Toronto, Singapore, Canberra, Hong Kong, and so on. In that sense, yesterday’s British East India Company and Barings, or today’s Anglo-American and Royal Dutch Shell, the family known variously as Welf, Hannover, Saxe-Coburg, Windsor, has been a “bourgeois” hereditary monarchy, with more likeness to a Doge of old Venice, or the Netherlands’ bloody-handed William of Orange, than to a Habsburg, Bourbon, Romanov, or Hohenzollern dynasty. The oligarchy, through a feudal *Fürstentum* under a chancellor such as von Kaunitz or Metternich, or a “bourgeois” assembly of financier-oligarchical nobility, retains implicitly the ultimate power of a Roman *pater familias*, to continue or replace the currently ruling hereditary monarchy.

Thus, by standard of legal system of government, the United Kingdom is, like ancient Italy under Capri’s Emperor Tiberius, merely the chief province of an imperial form of power, of imperial institutions whose legal authority is rooted in the imperial tradition of Babylon and Rome. Like ancient empires, the imperial state of today relies upon agencies whose existence lies essentially outside the reach of whatever other elected forms of government might appear. Consider, for example, Britain’s permanent civil-service bureaucracy, of the type which Anglophile U.S. dupes introduced as a corrupting “reform,” undermining the U.S. Constitution, as the U.S. civil-service system. In the British Empire of today, the monarchical management of both state and government of the United Kingdom, and of the larger British Commonwealth, is situated within the institution, of several hundreds persons, known as the Privy Council.

The Privy Council controls the *customary*, popular, side-show entertainment known as the Parliament, and, respecting all truly important matters, also controls the governments of all of the quasi-independent states of the so-called British Commonwealth. It determines who might be selected to constitute a parliamentary government, and, whose government, in good time, must endure a Major sort of disappointment. In fact, a government of a Commonwealth state might, occasionally, like present-day Sudan or Nigeria, resist the higher authority of the Privy Council, at mortal risk to the persons of the official, and his or her family, who attempts to free that state from the only slightly disguised colonial fist within the Commonwealth system.

The characteristic feature of all empires, this British Empire included, is axiomatically implicit in the specific type of oligarchy which predominates within the ranks of the assembly of the oligarchical families as a whole. In Britain, the ruling interest is of the financier-aristocratic, rather than, for example, the legendary, landed-aristocratic form of feudal Europe, or the theocratic form of ancient Babylon or Egypt.

All such differing varieties of the species called empire share in common an oligarchical principle which is axiomatically hateful toward the Christian appreciation of the Mosaic principle of *Genesis* 1: the principle, that man and woman are each made in the image of God, that mankind might thus exert a divinely assigned dominion within the universe. That latter is the principle which separates the imperial form from Christianity, and also from Islam, as the case of Prince Philip’s 1961 co-founding of the paganist World Wildlife Fund attests this fact. This fact is key to understanding the role of the British Empire in Jeremy Bentham’s and Lord Palmerston’s fostering the terrorist organizations of such British agents as Robespierre, Napoleon III, and Giuseppe Mazzini’s Young Europe, and London’s harboring of so many of the world’s leading terrorist organizations of today.

The key to all recent and present-day world history and politics, is a continuing, mortal conflict between two axiomatically irreconcilable political philosophies, the continuing conflict between the old imperialism, and its creation, the so-called materialist/empiricist Enlightenment of Paolo Sarpi, Galileo Galilei, Francis Bacon, Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, et al., versus the Renaissance heritage of the modern nation-state republic as that is typified by the examples of Gottfried Leibniz and the founding of the U.S.A. as a constitutional federal republic in 1789.

If one accepts the Christian reading of the cited Mosaic principle, then, it follows, that the state must be derived, not from the mere assembly of persons of which a nation is comprised at some choice of moment, nor, of the mere customary and other opinions of such persons, but, rather, from the principle that the state must be constituted to uphold the implications of a principle. The principle, which lies outside, and above the mere opinion of such children of the Ockhamite Enlightenment as U.S. Justice Antonin Scalia, is that truth

and justice must prevail, and these according to the fact that each newborn personality is made in the living image of the Creator, and must be developed, protected, and afforded opportunities in mortal life consistent with that fact. A state, such as a pro-Malthusian one, which evades that principle, is not morally fit to survive, and, ultimately, assuredly, will not survive.

The modern European form of nation-state, as first established by the Fifteenth-Century Renaissance, in Louis XI's France, occurred as an offshoot of the 1439-1440 sessions of the great, ecumenical Council of Florence, where the eastern and Augustinian rites of the Christian churches were temporarily unified, over the coordinated political opposition of Venice and Mount Athos. Despite all of the evils done in the name of European nations since the Fifteenth-Century Renaissance, it is simply a statistical fact, that, until a 1966 turn toward neo-Malthusian utopianism, the creation of the modern nation-state, in western Europe, has had the net effect of improving the life-expectancy and conditions of life of the average person on this planet as a whole, more than all other forms of culture combined up to the Fifteenth Century.

From the founding of the modern nation-state, in late-Fifteenth-Century France, a mortal struggle erupted between that new institution and all forms of the old imperial order, both landed and financial oligarchies. Following the near-defeat of the imperialist reactionary class, by the early Sixteenth-Century League of Cambrai, it was apparent to the leading imperial interest of that time, Venice, that the economic and related military superiority inhering in the new nation-state institution had brought the old order in Europe to an end. Venice's reaction to this perception, was: *Divide and conquer*. Beginning then, Venice fostered bloody schisms within western Europe's Christianity, while looking northward to find a new base for imperial financier and maritime operations, beyond its increasingly vulnerable base at the north of the Adriatic. The Netherlands and England were chosen as the locations to be cultivated for this latter purpose.

Beginning 1517, Venetian agents typified by Francesco Zorzi (Giorgi), Cardinal Pole, and Thomas Cromwell, utilized the Howard family's bait, Anne Boleyn, to lure a susceptible Henry VIII into adopting the schismatic role of an English *Pontifex Maximus*, and, a bit later, lured a susceptible Hapsburg dynasty into a foolish, bloody tyranny against the people of the Netherlands. Western Europe entered the last decades of the Sixteenth Century, divided within itself by rivers of bloody, politically-motivated, confessional strife.

In this setting, in 1582, a new Mephistopheles for every Faust of Europe, Paolo Sarpi, emerged to preeminent power within Venice. Sarpi launched a new political world-order in Europe, an anti-Renaissance world order known as the "Enlightenment" of his own and his lackey Galileo's protégés, Bacon, Hobbes, Locke, et al. Here lies the axiomatic key to London's current employment of international terrorism as an instrument of its global policy. Here lies the key to Lon-

don's presently ongoing, bloody, imperial, world-wide effort to eradicate both Christianity and Islam.

The practical essence of the matter is elementary. Under pre-Fifteenth-Century imperialism, over ninety-five percent of all parts of the human species lived under political regimes which condemned them to the status of slaves, serfs, or worse. This was true even of those parts of the world in which *Genesis 1* was revered. The intent to recognize each person as equal before God may have existed; but, the means to realize that intent efficiently in political practice was wanting.

The Fifteenth-Century founding of the modern nation-state, by the Renaissance's Augustinian Christianity, was the outgrowth of an effort to establish a form of society consistent with Christian principles derivable from *Genesis 1*: that every man and woman is made in the image of God, within a humanity assigned to exert dominion within the universe. That form of society could only be one which cultivated the developable, potential, sovereign creative powers of mind of each newborn person, and which afforded the person so educated opportunities consistent with the human individual's divinely given nature. Thus, we have, in Latin, the principles of *imago viva Dei* and *capax Dei*, upon which leading Fifteenth-Century churchmen allied with Cardinal Nicolaus of Cusa gave birth to the modern nation-state republic.

For reason of such considerations, those reactionary oligarchical forces centered upon imperial Venice, directed their political efforts to attacking, and seeking to eradicate, those principles of natural law which oblige society to seek political and economic forms in which the realization of the divinely supplied nature of the human individual is efficient constitutional law. It was in service of a specifically contrary, diabolical, oligarchical purpose, that Paolo Sarpi chose to create the specifically anti-Christian, empiricist dogma of law and scientific inquiry, typified by the writings of Sarpi's personal lackey, Galileo, of Francis Bacon, Hobbes, Locke, Mandeville, Adam Smith, and Jeremy Bentham: the nominalist dogma of the notorious William of Ockham.

The political essence of the matter, as typified by that Hobbesian kind of British-Israelite cultism of Britain's Lord William Rees-Mogg, or of the kindred, U.S.-based devotees of anti-Islamic "Temple Mount" terrorism, is that such devotees of the Brutish Empire insist that no "divine spark of reason" exists within the human individual. *By denying this legal protection of divinity to the human individual, those Brutish wretches seek to eliminate all efficient legal prohibition against the return of the ninety-five percent or more of the human population—of the United Kingdom, and elsewhere—to the status of illiterate slaves, serfs, or worse, even mere corpses of a generously culled human herd.*

This is precisely what the loquacious Rees-Mogg has explicitly advocated, in stipulating his utopian proposal that under his beloved "information society" utopia, ninety-five percent, precisely, of future populations must be left absolutely illiterate, just as the slave-owner class in the U.S.A. and

the short-lived C.S.A., assigned capital penalties for allowing African-American slaves to be able to read and write, or as relevant Harvard University professors today bemoan the cruelty of imposing the development of cognitive potentials upon African-American minds which such Harvard dons deem genetically unsuited for such ministrations.

So, modern neo-Malthusians, such as World Wildlife Fund co-founder Prince Philip, arrogate to themselves and their cronies the power to “cull the human herd” as they might deem suited to the interest of the future Great White Bwana game-hunters of a largely depopulated sub-Saharan Africa. So, self-avowed British agent and avowed mass-murderer Henry A. Kissinger could write NSSM-200 in 1974, in his dual role as U.S. Secretary of State and National Security Advisor: insisting that populations of continents such as Africa must be depopulated, lest they, with their tendency to breed in excessive numbers and their wont for economic self-improvement, might consume excessively those local natural resources which the Anglo-American oligarchy might covet for its own future use. So, the most evil man of the Twentieth Century, Britain’s Bertrand Russell, wrote, in 1923, of culling the population of Africa by methods which “are disgusting even if they are necessary.”

So, the great Heinrich Heine wrote, in German, “*Wie eng, wie englisch.*” In plain English: How Brutish.

### **Why Brutish terrorism now?**

The untimely death of a great adversary of the British Empire and its Adam Smith, patriotic U.S. President Franklin Roosevelt, cleared the way for Churchill’s London to induce a suggestible President Truman to drop two nuclear weapons, without any military justification, on the civilian populations of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. This act set into motion the policy which Bertrand Russell had crafted, as he explained his doctrine of the nuclear pathway to UNO world government, in the September 1946 edition of *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*. Russell lamented what he deemed the cowardice of the U.S.A., in failing to launch a preemptive nuclear attack upon the Soviet Union, but envisioned a prolonged, if managed nuclear conflict between the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R., as a means which might lead to a UNO world government by a more roundabout, longer route than preventive nuclear war.

Later, after the U.S.S.R. had developed nuclear arsenals, Russell stated publicly, that he had meant every word he had spoken earlier, in proposing that if Moscow rejected submission to UNO world government, a “preemptive” nuclear attack should be launched. London’s backing for such nuclear terrorism during such events of the 1940s, is key for understanding London’s use of the post-1966 forms of international terrorism, such as the terrorists of Fidel Castro’s São Paulo Forum, today.

Since Russell’s initial proposal of a nuclear-weapons pathway to UNO world government, the world has passed through two most critical phases of transition toward the im-

perialist “globaloney” of UNO world-government dictatorship, with intended, accompanying elimination of the last vestiges of sovereign nation-state institutions. The first is pivoted around the “Cuba Missiles Crisis” of 1962; the second is the 1989-1991 disintegration of the Soviet Union.

In the first instance, the 1962-1964 phases of negotiation of nuclear “détente,” it was the prevailing view of the Anglo-American oligarchical establishment, that general warfare, such as that of World Wars I and II, especially general nuclear war, was safely ruled out as a possibility for the future. Only local wars, especially “surrogate wars,” such as the 1964-1972 diplomatic *Grand Guignol* in Indo-China, as diplomatic bargaining-chips among the Anglo-American, Soviet, and China nuclear powers, or terrorist forms of “irregular warfare,” were considered likely.

This presumption was taken, from 1964 on, as the occasion for the infection of the university-student component of the post-war generation of youth, by a new, extreme form of radical “youth counterculture,” echoing, but more savage, than that of the 1920s and 1930s. The characteristic feature of this radically existentialist youth-counterculture, was the emphasis upon neo-Malthusian forms of post-industrial, post-nation-state utopianisms. The international explosions of youth ferment, during 1968, led to a wider infection of the young with the same anti-scientific irrationalism, and, also, to a march of young adults so infected, “through the institutions” of government, education, and business, throughout most of the world, including, by way of such channels as London’s Laxenberg, Austria-based Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), the Soviet Union itself.

These developments of the 1960s and 1970s established the foundations of today’s institutionalized forms of London-coordinated international terrorism. During the 1980s collaboration in global homicide between Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and SSG head and Vice-President George Bush, close funding relations were welded between the narco-terrorist gangs and weapons-trafficking and covert warfare operations of Thatcher and Bush. During these 1980s, the U.S. “secret government,” Executive Order 12333 operations headed by Vice-President Bush, imitated the traditional British and Israeli practice of conducting the dirtiest varieties of secret-intelligence and related operations, not through entities controlled by official U.S. intelligence agencies, such as the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), but through private business organizations, coordinated by Bush at the SSG office within the National Security Council, and located discreetly under a not-so-secret office within the provenance of the U.S. military Joint Chiefs of Staff. A symbiotic relationship was established with the world’s leading narco-terrorist organizations, through which drug-trafficking, with overlapping international weapons-trafficking operations, were a principal source of funding for the privately conducted dirty operations under the responsible direction of Thatcher and Bush.

This narco-trafficking nexus, is the root of the working

connections which have evolved between those dirty operations of Britain, the U.S.A., et al., on the one side, and the narco-terrorists of the variety used in the present-day Colombia and Peru theaters. It is for related reasons that ex-President and Moon-cult lackey George Bush is still feared so much in high places inside the U.S., and elsewhere, today. This is not to suggest great love of Bush or London toward terrorist assets: bombs are used, not to be loved, but for exploding themselves against selected targets, for furthering thus-adopted strategic and related policies.

A better appreciation of the connections is obtained by close study of London-coordinated agencies such as Amnesty International and Greenpeace. Sometimes, Amnesty adopts a worthy cause, which seems but to serve to provide a kind of protective coloration for cases in which Amnesty's advocacies are much less worthy, and better suited, like the activities of many Commonwealth-connected UNO Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), to fostering destabilizations of targeted nations or their current governments. Greenpeace's activities, as studied by *EIR*, show unblemished spots even less often than Amnesty. Interesting in both cases, are the correlations between the advocacies of these organizations and those of clearly certifiable terrorist or terrorist-type organizations, and also the support they attract from the utterances of the oligarchy-controlled mass media.

A similar case is established for the U.S.A.'s so-called National Endowment for Democracy (NED), a virtual tool of very dirty organizations specializing in subversion, such as Freedom House and the Anti-Defamation League (ADL). The former, like Freedom House's Leo Cherne himself, is an offshoot of the Bukharinite Communist International Right Opposition, via Bukharinite Communist Jay Lovestone's International Rescue Committee and Lovestone's former base in the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union (ILGWU), then otherwise known among its trade-union victims as "Dubinsky's Plantation." This is also a key link for operations of the Bush-Kissinger gang inside the International Republican Institute.

These observations merely illustrate some features of a proliferation of such private arrangements, intersecting secret-intelligence operations around the world. These kinds of connections must seem incomprehensibly convoluted until one has learned the key by means of which the apparent mystery is decoded. Then, one recognizes that the appearance of mystery was created by nothing other than the misguided assumptions of the naive onlooker. Once we recognize the implications of the difference between nation-state institutions and imperial (e.g.) oligarchical forms, the mystery evaporates.

In the law implicit in oligarchical forms of society, the institutions of the state exist as virtual lackeys of the collective oligarchy itself. The ordinary people have no more rights in this matter than household pets or creatures of the gentleman farmer's barnyard. Only the fragile protection afforded by custom provides a partial substitute for lacking human rights.

Even the individual member of an oligarchical family is normally subject to the authority of the state apparatus, in the same sense that the individual member of the Roman family was subject to the virtual powers of extinction held in the hands of the *pater familias*.

However, frequently, the oligarchy, or a significant section of it, may create private organizations outside the authority of the state, and secure for these organizations a protective screen supplied by the state. The result of such arrangements is therefore mystifying to those who suffer the delusory belief, that the power of government (e.g., the British state) is derived from the consent of the majority of the population, that the state is, so to speak, an epiphenomenon of the people in that way. Similarly, to the degree that the U.S.A. itself has come to tolerate the existence of a collection of oligarchical families, akin to, and, in significant part, a direct extension of the set of the British oligarchical families, we, in the United States, have acquired perversions of our constitutional government which mimic the British order.

Exemplary is the fact that sections of the U.S. Federal government, such as the Criminal Division of the U.S. Department of Justice, or, to a large degree, the Federal judiciary, are captive controlled assets of sets of oligarchical families existing virtually outside the rule of constitutional government. Here lies the case of Sir George "Rubbers" Bush, and the globally extended secret, and generally very, very dirty operations which he headed during most of his term as U.S. Vice-President.

In such arrangements, a section of the oligarchy may, on the one hand, create and direct an off-the-reservation private organization of the same general type as Amnesty International or Greenpeace, while, on the other hand, the same families protect that private organization's undertakings, both through control of influential mass media, and through controlling channels of influence over relevant judicial and other governmental institutions.

The overlap of Freedom House and the ADL with the National Endowment for Democracy, is illustrative of this type of oligarchical corruption pervading our system of government today. Such is the relationship between what Freedom House represents as a private asset of certain oligarchical families, and the role of Freedom House's Leo Cherne in the secret government arrangements, under Executive Orders 12333, 12334, and 12335, in whose provenance Bush and Kissinger operated within the U.S.'s oligarchical "secret government" apparatus during the 1980s.

## **Now, the case of Sudan**

There is a continuous line, from the 1961 co-founding of the World Wildlife Fund (now, World Wide Fund for Nature) by Britain's Duke of Edinburgh, Kissinger's 1974 writing of the mass-murderous U.S. National Security Study Memorandum-200, and the genocide, against millions, which the Baronesses Chalker's and Cox's British monarchy is directing



against the populations of Rwanda, Burundi, and Zaire today: the greatest rate of genocide against any nation in the modern history of mankind to date. Some have speculated recently, that Prince Philip's early interest in the case of the Giant Panda may have been stimulated by understandable sympathy for the poor creature's defective breeding habits. In this undertaking, Prince Philip and the Netherlands' famous Nazi-SS veteran, Prince Bernhard, have drawn upon one of the deepest traditions of Paolo Sarpi's Enlightenment, the so-called "Malthusian" doctrine originally elaborated by Venice's Giammaria Ortes. Throughout, the argument is the same as those of racist mass-murderer Bertrand Russell, and of the disgusting Henry A. Kissinger, both of whom are typical of those who state that the population of peoples of darker complexions must be drastically reduced to the advantage of future generations of the British imperial oligarchy.

The oligarchical interest which Russell and Kissinger have served on this account, is clearly aware that the present world financial and monetary system is at the verge of evaporating, and that very soon, in the greatest wave of crises in all economic history. Only the dumber donkeys of politics and finance still delude themselves that the present system might manage to survive the presently ongoing global financial crises. The nobler asses have a different agenda: to grab control over the majority of the world's most critical raw-material

assets before the present financial system goes out of existence: to come out of that collapse owning the world's largest share of those raw materials on which life depends: the world's international trade in short food supplies, and the major part of the world's supplies of "energy" and what have been called "strategic minerals." This brings us to the matter of Africa.


The London-centered international food cartel has already orchestrated a vast, artificially induced shortfall in world food supplies. Already, many so-called developing nations of the world are being controlled by Kissinger-like "food blackmail." In the wake of a general financial collapse, the policies and population-sizes of most of the world will be controlled by those who manage the shortfalls in world food supplies. Meanwhile, for "energy" and "strategic mineral" supplies, the richest concentrations of resources are to be found in the former Soviet region of Asia (Figure 1), and in Africa. Hence, the most populous nation of Africa, Nigeria, and, also, Cameroon, are targeted for their petroleum potentials (Figure 2). Hence, Africa, from southern Sudan down along the mountainous areas of Rwanda, Burundi, and eastern Zaire, into the South African shield (Figure 3), complements the former Soviet Union for the world's strategically crucial sources of strategic minerals.

The present, London-orchestrated genocide within the

## Books by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

The LaRouche case "represented a broader range of deliberate cunning and systematic misconduct over a longer period of time utilizing the power of the federal government than any other prosecution by the U.S. Government in my time or to my knowledge."

—Former U.S. Attorney General  
Ramsey Clark





**READ LAROUCHE'S BOOKS** and find out why the Establishment is so determined to silence his voice.

*The Power of Reason: 1988.*  
An autobiography by  
Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. \$10.00

*So, You Wish to Learn  
All About Economics* \$10.00

*The Science of Christian Economy  
and Other Prison Writings* \$15.00



Send checks or money orders to:

**Ben Franklin  
Booksellers, Inc.**

107 South King St.  
Leesburg, VA 22075  
phone 1-800-453-4108 (toll free)  
or 1-703-777-3661

Shipping and handling charges: Add \$4 for the first book and \$.50 for each additional book. Virginia residents add 4.5% sales tax.

We accept MasterCard, Visa, American Express, and Discover.

Great Lakes region of Central Africa, has its inception in the murder of Patrice Lumumba and related UNO and other operations in Shaba (then known as Katanga province) at the beginning of the 1960s. The overall operations now fully under way, were introduced to U.S.A. policy under avowed British agent Henry A. Kissinger as National Security Advisor and later Secretary of State under Presidents Nixon and Ford. The two lines of continuous, British imperial policy-development, as defined by those two historical references, account for the policies of London's Baronesses Chalker and Cox today against Sudan and also the genocide against the populations of Rwanda, Burundi, and Zaire, today.

The case of Patrice Lumumba's assassination, illustrates the point that neither the French nor British Africa colonies have actually received sovereign independence from the colonial powers, down to the present day. "Certain authorities" were retained by the so-called "mother country" and its relevant financial authorities. The "mother country" (e.g., the British Privy Council) retained control in security, foreign policy, and financial matters touching upon the British Commonwealth, or comparable "Francophone" institutions as a whole. Patrice Lumumba's threat to violate that conditionality unleashed the London-Brussels reactions leading to Lumumba's assassination under the cover of UNO operations conducted by such presently senior, leading British intelligence assets of today as Conor Cruise O'Brien. Whenever a Commonwealth nation asserts sovereignty in a manner contrary to the spirit of the Privy Council's authority, as in the case of Nigeria, or Sudan, today, curious things occur.

For example: U.S. policy toward Sudan and Nigeria today.

As President Franklin Roosevelt warned, in those parts of the U.S. foreign-policy establishment which are most tightly controlled fiefdoms of the Anglophile oligarchical families of the U.S.A., there are "striped-pants boys," who, as Nixon's and Ford's Henry A. Kissinger bragged shamelessly about his own practices as National Security Advisor and Secretary of State, put their blind loyalties to London's Foreign Office policies first, and the interests of the U.S. a distant second. This continues in the U.S. State Department and its UNO offices to the present day. In the instance of Nigeria and Sudan, such corruption of the U.S. foreign-policy establishment works in the following way.

The common presumption under which these corrupted U.S. foreign-relations officials operate in the cases of Nigeria and Sudan, is, essentially, the following. These persons adopt the view that the British Commonwealth is a sphere of the special interest of a "sovereign ally," the monarchy and attached Privy Council of the United Kingdom. Thus, a finding by that choice of sovereign is read as a presumptive determination of fact, to the same effect it had been a finding reached by due process under U.S. law. The Commonwealth nation victimized in this manner is afforded no rights where Anglophile influence reigns within the U.S. foreign-policy

circles. It may be convenient to secure an endorsement of British imperialism's libels from cheaply purchased or otherwise doubtful African-American notables, but that is only window-dressing; the essential, determining consideration is the U.S. Anglophile bureaucrat's unpatriotically Tory sentiments.

The same applies to conflicts between Anglophone and Francophone imperial interests, as in the cases of Britain's use of its Uganda puppet, Museveni, to invade and despoil Rwanda, and later to invade and perpetrate genocide within the territory of the sovereign state of Zaire. Although it is Commonwealth interests which are responsible for the genocide in the Great Lakes region, the Anglophile influence within the U.S. foreign-policy establishment permits a culpable Canada's sleight-of-hand to prevent any efforts to interrupt an ongoing genocide which is the most intense ever known in modern history. Where are the sanctions for reason of such vast human-rights violations, against the culpable agencies, including George Bush's former protégé, the British Colonial ("Overseas Development") Office butcher Museveni of Uganda?

Notably, in the case of Zaire, when France's President Jacques Chirac protested the criminal looting of Francophone territory by the Anglophone forces of Uganda's Museveni and Canada's Barrick International, London once again sent Chirac a message by way of a bomb on the Paris subway, as it had done during 1995, in terrorizing Chirac back onto an anti-Clinton, anti-U.S.A., *Entente Cordiale* posture which Chirac had maintained until the recent British Commonwealth atrocities in Zaire. As the well-known Charles Pasqua emphasized, following the latest bombing, the putative authors of the diplomatic bombings of the Paris subway system are an Anglo-U.S. mujahideen organization, nominally Algerian, but actually harbored, like many other international terrorists, in London itself.

To appreciate the implications of the more recent British Commonwealth atrocities in Africa, one must move ahead from the early 1960s, to the reign over U.S. foreign policy by British agent Henry A. Kissinger, during the early 1970s. One refers, thus, to the so-called "Bernard Lewis Plan," as it was commonly known back during those years.

In the Satanic parody of the Old Testament maintained, ostensibly in London, Lord Shelburne's Barings and British East India Company, begat the modern British foreign service, which begat the colonial office, which begat the India office, from which a rib was taken out to form the Arab Bureau known for the families of Soviet spies Philby and Maclean. The latter Arab Bureau came to be headed by Sir John Bagot Glubb Pasha, and was enriched, in a manner of speaking, by staffing with an Oxford Arabist known as Bernard Lewis. Said Bernard Lewis was seconded to the U.S.A., to the hospitality of a London-coordinated, Bertrand Russell-connected agency known as the Aspen Institute. There, this British intelligence official replicated British imperial policy for South




FIGURE 1  
**Natural resources in the former Soviet region of Asia**

FIGURE 2  
**Petroleum and other resources in Nigeria and Cameroon**



**Key to natural resources in Figures 1-3**


Symbol	Resource	Symbol	Resource
Ag	Silver	Lig	Lignite
Al	Aluminum	Ls	Limestone
Asb	Asbestos	M	Mica
Au	Gold	Marb	Marble and alabaster
Be	Beryllium/beryl	Mn	Manganese
Bx	Bauxite	NaAsh	Soda ash, trona
C	Coal	NG	Natural gas
Cb	Columbium (niobium)	NGL	Natural gas liquids
Cd	Cadmium	Ni	Nickel
Cem	Cement	P	Phosphate
Clay	Clays	Pb	Lead
Co	Cobalt	Pet	Petroleum
Cr	Chromite	PGM	Platinum-group metals
Cs	Cesium	RE	Rare earths
Cu	Copper	S	Sulfur
Dia	Diatomite	Salt	Salt
Dm	Diamond	Sb	Antimony
Em	Emery	Se	Selenium
F	Fluorspar	Sn	Tin
Fe	Iron ore	Ta	Tantalum
Fz	Fertilizer	Tc	Talc
Gm	Gemstones	Ti	Titanium (rutile or ilmenite)
Gr	Graphite	U	Uranium
Gyp	Gypsum	W	Tungsten
Hg	Mercury	Zn	Zinc
Kao	Kaolin		

○ Group of producing mines or wells  
 ( ) Undeveloped significant resource  
 Underlined symbol indicates plant



FIGURE 4

## British-directed operations against Sudan



**1 Nimule:** After a failed attempt in October 1995 to take Juba, with the backing of the Ugandan National Resistance Army, the forces of John Garang's remaining faction of the Sudanese People's Liberation Army (SPLA) holds only a pocket of territory on the Ugandan border, defended by the heavily fortified town of Nimule.

**2 Kassala:** In 1996, the SPLA has moved operations to Eritrea, where forces have attacked Sudan at Kassala, with British backing. Under urging of Deputy Speaker of the British House of Lords Baroness Caroline Cox, Eritrea has turned over the Sudanese embassy in Asmera to the "National Democratic Alliance," a coalition of discredited Sudanese opposition groups, which includes Garang. The Sudan railway and oil pipeline running from Port Sudan to Khartoum, and the highway running from Khartoum to Kassala and to Port Sudan, are, obviously, more vulnerable to military sabotage from Eritrea, than from Garang's defeated front in the south.

**3 Pochala:** Forces operating from Ethiopia seized the small post town of Pochala on the border in fall 1996.

has a current operation deployed against Sudan, some overtly military, others potential military operations poised under a commercial cover (Figure 4). Then, turn attention to the mountain ranges running southward from Juba in southern Sudan, by way of Bukavu in Zaire's eastern Kivu province, down through Shaba (formerly Katanga) province, into the heart of the mineral-rich South African shield. Pay especially close attention to the virtually extra-territorial regions, set up as the British monarchy's controlled "wildlife preserves" within, or adjoining this mountainous region (Figure 5).

Look then, at the operations which London has run through its Uganda puppet, President Museveni, in Museveni's invasion and takeover over Rwanda, the coup in Burundi, and Museveni's invasion of eastern Zaire's Kivu province, seeking to take out of Kinshasa's Francophone control the petroleum and mineral reserve now under corporate control of former U.S. President Sir George "Moonie" Bush's Canada-based Barrick International. Take into account related commercial ventures sought on the Central African Republic's borders with Sudan.

Consider the fact, that those aspects of overall British operations which President Museveni's masters in London have run through ex-Communist John Garang have now virtually folded up. He could obtain amnesty under the same char-


ter which brought peace to the most among the relevant regions of southern Sudan; his former associates, and others consider it more likely, he is at the verge of retiring to a place prepared for his exile, inside Sir George Bush's U.S.A.; so, London turns to place emphasis on its other assets, focussing upon the use of mercenary and other forces deployed via Eritrea and Ethiopia, while opening up new threats from Zaire and elsewhere along the southern borders of Sudan.

From London's standpoint, the process of "culling Africa's human herd" shall continue, each moment employing whatever available means appear suited to that purpose, at that time. One asset fails, others are selected to replace him; so, the British-directed genocide against sub-Saharan Africa; so, U.S. assets of British Africa policy, whether foreign-policy Anglophiles or corruptible African-Americans, continue to play their ugly parts in this genocide. Death marches on.

The unfortunate additional feature of this hideous process, is that, all too often, the victims themselves let careless emotions and popularized mythologies lure them into suicidal positions. Too often, as in sports-minded Europe and the United States, too, the passions of the playing field overwhelm the will, and put reason to one side. As the British imperialists play their customary game of "divide and conquer," each

FIGURE 5

**'Protected areas' in Eastern Africa**



party so pitted against one another allows a playing-field passion for defeating that opponent to blind him to the fact that both are victims, virtually mere gladiators condemned to war against one another for the delight and advantage of some imperial Nero seated above the bloody sands of the arena. The enraged man's release of passion, in sinking sword into opponent's flesh, blinds him to the fact that the death of such an opponent merely serves to bring his own doom nearer, that his passion merely serves the purpose of the common master and manipulator of victor and vanquished alike.

Wiser heads are ruled by a higher principle than those borrowed from the curious substitute for "patriotism" typical of the sports arena's teams. There is but one true issue in all the global conflict of this time of awesome crisis: shall we choose that principle of the sovereign nation-state republic, a kind of republic fitted to the requirement that all persons shall be citizens of a sovereign republic, in which they enjoy the rights, the nurture, and the opportunities suited for men and women who are each born in the image of God the Creator? In other words, shall we make this a final battle to rid the world of the bestial traditions of Babylon and the Enlightenment, to establish the supremacy on this planet of those institutions of the sovereign nation-state republic, as our United States was intended to be, under which all persons live in political and economic circumstances suited to men and women each made in the image of God?

That is the reason that the British empire in its present form is the enemy of all mankind, not only the Scots and the Irish, or the people of Sudan. It is not an enemy as a manic team-player eyes the opposing team; it is the enemy because, for the moment, it is, in fact, Satan's own chief errand-boy on this planet. It is not evil because London is inhabited by a very rude sort of putatively English-speaking people; it is evil because it is the imperial residence of the empiricism associated with Sarpi, Bacon, Locke, Hume, Adam Smith, and Jeremy Bentham, as the French Satan is the Enlightenment's Descartes and Voltaire. These forces are evil because Hobbes' and Locke's empiricism, like Descartes and Kant, denies the principle that man and woman are made in the image of God. These forces are evil because they represent a dominant force on this planet, acting with malicious cupidity as the servant of that wicked denial of the most essential human right of every person on this planet.

If Africa struggles foolishly for any lesser objective than the one we have identified here, the future of all of sub-Saharan Africa would be assuredly, virtually hopeless. The United States of Presidents Washington and Lincoln has no enemy who follows that policy of the sovereign nation-state implicit in *Genesis* 1; we have no true friend, or loyal citizen who does not.