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 *devolved* 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.