

## Lyndon LaRouche Visits Sudan

# Sudan, Nigeria of strategic importance, statesman stresses

*The following remarks by Lyndon LaRouche are excerpted from the weekly radio interview "EIR Talks." He was interviewed by Mel Klenetsky on Dec. 28.*

**EIR:** I understand that you had a very exciting visit to Sudan. Can you tell us a little bit about it?

**LaRouche:** There are two things about it of significance. First of all, the President [Clinton] and his close advisers are attempting to prevent a crowd in London from, among other things, getting a general war going against Islam; and therefore, I was very happy to visit our friends in Sudan, with the thought that the facts I would be able to develop in my own way, would be helpful to furthering that process of seeking peace and stability around the world.

I met with the President of Sudan. I was a guest there. I met with many ministers of government. We had about three or four meetings a day, which were featured on television. At the beginning of each meeting, they had the TV cameras there, and I would appear on the nightly news.

I met also with religious leader Dr. Hassan Abdullah Al-Turabi; I had one meeting with him, and another chance to run into him at an evening reception which went on for some time, where we had some discussion with others.

There will be a major report appearing in *EIR* in a month or so, covering in-depth the background on this area.

The significance is that, although very few Americans or even Europeans know it, World War I actually began on Sept. 2, 1898, at the junction of the White and Blue Nile in the vicinity of what is today Khartoum. The British went down there under Kitchener with the grandfather of the present head of the United Nations—Boutros Pasha Boutros-Ghali was his name. He was commander of the Egyptian forces which marched with the British. They slaughtered the independent government of Sudan at the time; but the actual purpose of that expedition was to bring about the capitulation of France to British power, and it was that capitulation of the French to the British in the context of the Sudan crisis, as it was called, of 1898, that the Entente Cordiale was created between Britain and France, which led to World War I.

The significance is that today there are many people, especially in London, who are trying to influence certain people around our State Department, or Rep. Frank Wolf [R-Va.], into getting the United States into a fuss with Sudan. There are two countries in Africa, Nigeria and Sudan, both

presently slated for destruction by London. If those two countries, or either one of them, goes, is disintegrated as London wishes, and as Frank Wolf wishes, apparently, all of sub-Saharan Africa, Black Africa, goes into the pit irreparably.

That has strategic implications which can affect the life and welfare of everybody on this planet, including people in the United States, who don't realize how important Africa is to them.

So, it was a very useful, a very necessary, and a very happy visit.

**EIR:** Can you tell us why the British would be targeting particularly Nigeria and Sudan?

**LaRouche:** If you remember, back in the beginning of the 1970s—Henry Kissinger in 1982 publicly stated that he'd been a British agent, an agent of the British foreign intelligence service while directing U.S. policy under Nixon and Ford—Kissinger brought in a British intelligence agent by the name of Bernard Lewis. Lewis was an associate of Glubb Pasha, who was head of the so-called Arab Bureau section of British foreign intelligence. They set up a program which became known, in part, as the "Arc of Crisis" policy, or the "Bernard Lewis Plan." And one adjunct of this was the so-called "Horn of Africa Plan."

Under this plan, which was put into effect in the early 1970s under Kissinger, every nation of the region, from the subcontinent of Asia, including India, up through Iran and Turkey, and down into the Horn of Africa, Ethiopia, Kenya, and so forth, was targeted for a general destabilization as part of some master strategic plan.

As a result, in 1975, Kissinger negotiated with the Soviet government. People will recall that at that time, Ethiopia was being supported by the United States government; the Eritrean Liberation Front, which was fighting a war against Ethiopia, was supported by the Soviets. And the Soviets were also sponsoring Somaliland. Kissinger cut a deal with Moscow, and they switched partners: The United States began to support Somaliland, and the Soviets took over Ethiopia.

Go back to 1975, and look at the area since then. As a result of Kissinger's deal with Moscow in switching support, a war was launched between Somalia and Ethiopia, and both were pretty much destroyed, as a result of that.

In the meantime, the British destroyed Uganda through a series of operations which involved the former head of

Tanzania, Julius Nyerere, who was pretty much the key British agent in East Africa during that period.

They now have a dictator called [Yoweri] Museveni there. The country's pretty much destroyed, but he has a "private army," so to speak, called the Army of Uganda. *He's run entirely by British intelligence and the British monarchy, who supply him his weapons. He is run day-to-day by the Overseas Development Minister, Lady Lynda Chalker, in London. He's very close to her. He has destroyed Rwanda, in collaboration with the World Wildlife Fund [now the World Wide Fund for Nature]. He has now launched the destruction of Burundi. He was running John Garang on behalf of the British, who is sort of a mercenary dupe that the British were running in southern Sudan, trying to destabilize Sudan. He is involved in trying to chop up eastern Zaire. He is also involved, together with British Kikuyu assets in Kenya, in launching a general destabilization and destruction of Kenya.*

So Sudan is in an area in which it and all the other adjoining nations are targeted for destruction, as a continuation of a British plan which we knew in the United States as the Kissinger and Brzezinski "Bernard Lewis Plan" or "Arc of Crisis Plan" or "Horn of Africa Plan."

That's the general nature of it. The British are out to destroy all of Africa, there's no bones about it. When Prince Philip says that he wishes (he's said this publicly in interviews, he's said it in writing, in his introduction to a book) that he wishes that he could be reincarnated as a deadly virus, so that he might hasten the death rate and eliminate the overpopulation, as he describes it, in, among other places, Africa, that's what's afoot.

It's not that they're just trying to steal stuff down there; these fellows are ideologues, they're dangerous ideologues. They're ideologues in the same sense that Adolf Hitler was an ideologue, and they represent perhaps a somewhat greater danger to the world as a whole than Hitler did. Sudan and Nigeria are *bastions* against the way the British are playing their assets, including so-called "tribal rivalries" in Africa. And these two countries standing there, still standing up, make a big difference. If they go, there's nothing that's going to stop all of Africa from going into a Dark Age from which it might not come out in 200 years.

**EIR:** At the recent Casablanca conference of Islamic countries, there was a statement issued making a sharp distinction between the Islamic religion and terrorist operations. Did you see a growing awareness in the Islamic community of the kind of provocations that the British and the French are using in terms of their control of these terrorist operations?

**LaRouche:** Everyone who is in the relevant government and related circles, knows that these so-called Islamic terrorists are not Islamic terrorists. These are operations which are run through certain western and other intelligence services.

We've had the files open on the Stasi [former East German secret police] for some time. It's only a partial opening, but we can see now, when you look at terrorism in Germany



*Sudanese spiritual leader Dr. Hassan al-Turabi, shown here in October 1994 in Khartoum. Lyndon LaRouche describes his recent trip to Sudan and meetings with al-Turabi and other Sudanese leaders as "a very useful, a very necessary, and a very happy visit."*

and elsewhere during the 1970s, in the light of the Stasi files which have been opened . . . these are not Arab terrorists, these are not Islamic terrorists. These are operations which are run by intelligence services.

Now, the Islamic groups know this. It's difficult for them to deal with it, because they're dealing with a popular perception. The press says they are Islamic terrorists. So it's a problem to deal with it. What they do, is to distance themselves from it.

But most terrorists today are run by British intelligence, or agencies which work with it. The British play a very cute game, which they used to play together with the Soviet intelligence service. They would say that all imperial actions and all bad things which used to come from the British in the 19th century, now come 100% from the United States; and in the Arab sector, they will add "the Zionist lobby," or "the Zionists who control the United States." That's the usual line the British spread in their way of being cute, around the Middle East and elsewhere.

So the only problem here, is that many people who are being manipulated by British intelligence, directly or indirectly, will tell you: "Well, it's the United States that's 100% responsible for this stuff."

It is *not* the United States, even though we have some people like George Bush and Ollie North and some bad people. But, as we see very clearly in Clinton's struggle with London, London is behind the policies for which this terrorism is deployed, and the United States is doing its utmost, at least around the White House, within its understanding, to try to prevent this sort of thing. And this should be seen plainly and simply. This is not Islamic terrorism: This is British intelligence and similar kinds of people playing the usual kind of games.