

Look At What Happened in Brazil

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.¹

January 27, 2001

As more and more among the world's best-informed people will soon see, as they turn from the ugly noises in Washington, D.C., and toward the panic spreading from the U.S. state of California, this planet is teetering at the brink of the horror which is threatened by the combination of the habituated obsessions of the new administration in Washington, and the influence of the thuggish, maddened religious fanatics within that large and growing popular minority composing its mass political base. The looming threat is, that the U.S. is at the verge of being toppled into not merely a looming general, planet-wide breakdown of the presently depleted world economic system, but, possibly, even, desperate and chaotic actions, such as those now threatening Brazil, Indonesia, and others, actions, such as the wildfire spread of a new Middle East religious war, which could trigger the descent of the planet, chain-reaction-style, into a global new dark age.

Unless something is done, very soon, to reverse the policies now prevailing in Washington, that is the gloomy course of probable events, with which the British monarchy's newly reigning asset in Washington threatens our planet today. Of such times as these, it was often said, that those whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad. As certain symptomatic events in Washington, Brazil, Australia, and elsewhere, attest, the British monarchy, and probably the new Administration in Washington, too, is either already that mad, as mentally deranged as a barking "fundamentalist," or likely to soon become so.²

1. The author is a registered candidate for the 2004 nomination to become the President of the U.S.A.

2. "Mad as a hatter," were the appropriate term, were the reader familiar with


Against this background, what may prove to be one of the hottest stories breaking world-wide today, involves a fresh attack on me by the Bush Administration's beloved British monarchy, in both Australia and Brazil.

Once again, as on earlier occasions, the mere mention of my continued existence, seems to unsettle the British monarchy in about the same degree a passing thought about the Ardvaark might strike fear and trembling in a colony of termites. Not that Queen Elizabeth II and her family have ever had reasons to suspect they might be put at physical risk by me. That monarchy's repeatedly expressed fear, is of that type which may sometimes seize the guilty imagination of such royally predatory Romantic figures.

Those recurring fits of madness by that monarchy, foretell the likely toppling of a modern Nineveh. We may be near the time when the hand of history has lost its patience with such royal Olympian antics as those of Elizabeth II's crew. If you doubt that history has an efficient hand, I shall show you, before you have reached the close of this report, that, indeed, history does command the power to use exactly such a miraculous organ in its own defense of its continued existence.

This situates us to begin our account of some significant bits of current world history, by reference to breaking British news from Brazil. Start with that breaking story there, and then go up the back-trail, to discover the much bigger story behind that story, the bigger story, which affects our nation,

the implication of that English expression. The source of the expression was not the hatter's choice of profession, but the mental state induced by prolonged exposure to certain toxic materials once employed in that trade. Thus, one should be cautious about blaming a profession for the ills which may have been locally induced by some errant choice of employed human, or other materials, such as its selection of Prince Consort in the matters at hand in this report.



The latest attack on Lyndon LaRouche by the British monarchy, in both Australia and Brazil, is one of the hottest stories breaking internationally. The much bigger story behind that story, affects the future of all nations.

and will determine your personal fate as well.

The breaking story is this.

The Jan. 20 inauguration of U.S. President George W. Bush defined the global setting, in which fresh attacks were launched upon me personally, once again, from institutions, such as the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), associated with the interests of two picaresque figures, the veritable “Burke and Hare” of world politics today, British Royal Consort Philip Mountbatten and his most notable accomplice, “1001 Club” figure, and one-time Nazi party member, Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands.

Two currently notable such attacks erupted during the same fortnight within which that inauguration was situated. One of that pair of such atrocities against me, occurred in Brazil, on the day before the Bush inauguration, Jan. 19, in a disgusting action conducted on behalf of the local, national subsidiary of the WWF. The second, in Australia, on Jan. 24, was a travesty launched on behalf of an organization represented by four officials of Queen Elizabeth II’s Privy Council. In both incidents, the attacks came in the form of malicious actions demanding a summary suppression of the human rights of designated persons, whom the perpetrators identified as associated with me personally. As on earlier such occasions, the predators in these cases, have expressed themselves with a barrage of perverse British actions wrought in willfully reckless disregard for truth.

Some presumably authoritative sources, have attributed the British monarchy’s recurring such role in targeting of

me, to an obsessive and even perhaps murderous obsession with me by the Royal Consort, Prince Philip. For example, on June 15, 1998, the London *Guardian* published a vile slander article by Francis Wheen, characterizing a raging fight between “Mr. LaRouche and Mr. Big,” a reference to Royal Consort Prince Philip. In the piece, Wheen, who has been identified by reliable London sources as a “poison pen” for the Monarchy, charged that I was behind a campaign to vilify Prince Philip as the man behind the assassination of Princess Diana in August 1997, and behind the conspiracy to bring down the Presidency of Bill Clinton — in order to consolidate a world dictatorship under the House of Windsor. The Wheen article was provoked by the appearance of my associate, *EIR* editor Jeffrey Steinberg, on two British television broadcasts on June 3 and 4, 1998, reviewing evidence that the wrongful deaths of Princess Diana and Dodi Fayed were murders. Steinberg told Channel 4 interviewer Martyn Gregory that he “could not rule out” that Prince Philip was behind the death of Princess Diana. Those remarks triggered a flurry of British media slanders against me — all emanating from news organizations fiercely loyal to the Windsors, led by the *Daily Telegraph* of Prince Philip’s 1001 Club associate Conrad Black. That is at least a plausible report, and might be both true and relevant. Nonetheless, I would place the crucial emphasis on a more scientific appreciation of the way in which important developments are caused to appear, as I explain in the concluding portion of this present report.

Then comes the bigger story, the story behind the story.

As in astrophysics, so in real-life politics, any observed object's mere existence, is always less important, than the orbit which controls its destination, whether as a comet, a planet, a moon, an asteroid, a national culture, a political institution, or Philip Mountbatten. It is a regime's intention, as expressed by the crucial physical effects of its orbit, which controls the shape of its events, and usually the behavior among most of the relevant actors.

The cause of a planet's motion, is not the mere individual events observed within the orbit itself. Only a fool focusses only on the local events occurring on the surface of an asteroid which is targetting our Earth. As the founder of modern astrophysics, Johannes Kepler, emphasized, in his *The New Astronomy*, in connection with his original discovery of a principle of universal gravitation, it is the apparent intention, as expressed by the paradoxical features in the trajectory of that asteroid itself, its orbit, which is the threat to be addressed. So it is with great empires, or entire cultures which have vanished into the past, or in the case of the presently hegemonic political institutions of our planet today.

In this case, the bigger story is, that what is threatening Earth, is not an asteroid, but the broader and deeper implications associated with the greatest financial collapse in history, a collapse long oncoming, and due to arrive at its destination very soon, unless, as I have demanded, the new Bush Administration changes its policies, on energy deregulation and other matters very soon, profoundly, and suddenly.

It is not some particular deeds of the British monarchy's representatives, which are the determining consideration in the particular pattern of events addressed in this report; the threatened evil, in this case, comes not from isolable particular policies, but, rather, from that intention, or, one might say, the orbit of that monarchy's history, an intention which, as the great Carl Gauss proved Kepler's method for the case of the orbit of the asteroid Ceres, is merely expressed by the incidents such as those bearing on recent developments in Brazil and Australia.

1. The Brazil and Australia Cases

The Jan. 19 attack, in Brazil, was first attempted on behalf of the World Wide Fund for Nature, in a brief dated Oct. 16, 2000.

WWF-Brazil first filed that 23-page brief against persons associated with me, the Ibero-American Solidarity Movement (MSIA), before a civil court in the city of Rio de Janeiro. The WWF's request, for an order to search for and seize MSIA documents, was denied by Judge Paulo Mauricio Pereira, who ruled:

"... Secondly, no concrete evidence is presented that the information issued by the first party [defendant] is false or distorted, and it is also the case that they are not the only ones issuing such opinions, which summarize an entire discussion

involving what nationalists call the 'imperialist policy of the great world powers' and 'the policy of internationalizing the Amazon,' matters which have for a long time been discussed in the press, including by members of the Brazilian government and military, the latter because of the duty they have to safeguard our borders and sovereignty."

A desperate WWF then appealed to the Court of Justice of the State of Rio de Janeiro, filing a second, 18-page brief dated Dec. 11, 2000, together with an earlier brief. That appeal was granted on Jan. 17, 2001, in an Antonin Scalia-style intervention by an appeals court judge, Edson Scisínio. Although no evidence has been presented which would competently contradict Judge Paulo Mauricio Pereira's ruling as to fact, a raid against the MSIA office was carried out on Friday, Jan. 19, 2001 at 5 p.m.

In assessing the international pattern of developments, of which the Brazil case is only one important aspect, the outstanding fact is that WWF-Brazil targets me personally. On that account, the WWF-Brazil's brief states the following:

"... the MSIA [the publisher which is the leading defendant in the case] says that it is part of an international movement led by the U.S. economist Lyndon LaRouche, which has as its objective the defense of sovereign nation-states and the reconstruction of the world economy, based on the adoption of a new international monetary and financial system and on great infrastructure projects. They believe that, in these initiatives, 'are found the bases for a new Renaissance that will allow humanity to overcome the present crisis of civilization and avoid the onset of a New Dark Age.'"

That far, that isolable portion of the WWF brief is, its defects aside, fair comment.

The WWF-Brazil then adds a wildly false statement, in which WWF proceeds in what proves to be, characteristically, willfully reckless, and systemic disregard for truth. It argues, thus, that its

"... image before Brazilian society is vital for its very survival. Because of the above, it is patently clear that the intent of the Defendants to truly damage the honor of the Appellant before society, using a frightening exercise of speculative fantasy, distorting known facts, and adding them to events constructed in their own imagination, and to unsustainable lies."

There is no truthfulness in that WWF characterization of the relevant MSIA publications.

There are many additional falsehoods, and what may be simply, negligent, if important errors of fact, in addition to those, in both the two, October and December, briefs which have been submitted by WWF-Brazil to date. At the same time, everything which the MSIA has published is verified as true, in contrast to much in these WWF briefs that is either explicitly lies, or, at its best, willfully reckless in disregard for fact.

In short, the evidence on the public record so far, is, that everything which the WWF considers damaging to its cause,

in material actually reported by MSIA, is not only heavily documented fact, but its truthfulness had been, as had been implied by Judge Paolo Mauricio Pereira's cited ruling, widely acknowledged among numerous representatives of the most responsible and prestigious circles of Brazilian society.

The desperation shown by the WWF in this case, is therefore understandable. It is WWF-Brazil's actions on behalf of its global, mother organization, which are the more significant feature of the action, a feature even more ominous globally than the immediate and obvious, awful threat, which some might view as even treasonous, represented by WWF's policy, to the continued political stability of Brazil itself.³ The personal attack on me, shows that WWF's targeting of Brazil expresses a much broader, global intention.

If Brazil's government were toppled by aid of WWF's activity, then all of continental Europe, not excluding "Teddy" Goldsmith's France, in addition to Brazil itself, would be obviously the next target on the list for destruction. If Europe, too, goes under as a continuation of the chain-reaction touched off in Brazil, the fate of the rest of the planet is menaced accordingly.

Therefore, as its own brief implies, the WWF has no true facts it has been willing to present, to support its plea for official help from the legitimate institutions of Brazil. Instead of relevant facts, WWF and its legal representatives have resorted to the following legal sophistry:

"We are not here discussing the constitutional right of the free expression of thought, but rather demonstrating that a defamatory campaign perpetrated by the Defendants . . . is causing incalculable damage to its [WWF's] image, as well as to its members and supporters."

WWF-Brazil's December appeal brief argues:

"The logical conclusion drawn is, that these defamatory activities, including the improper use of our trademark [no trade-mark infringement actually occurred], would continue, unless Your Excellency were to take immediate measures; it being the case that, were the Defendants allowed to continue with their defamatory activities until such time as a judge would rule on the matter, Appellant's reputation would be irreparably affected."

In choosing to employ the latter argument, the Appellants have implied that Brazil is a virtual colony of the British monarchy, and thus, not a sovereign nation, but, rather, subject to presumptive forms of laws, according to the principle of *lèse majesté*, which are among the peculiarities of that monarchy. In this case, it is the claim of the British monarchy's creation, the WWF, which claims, through WWF-Brazil, to invoke a higher, supranational authority over Brazil than the Brazil constitution and legal tradition itself. It was, therefore, not prudent of the Appellants to demand, as WWF's virtual plea of last resort did, that Brazil's courts rule to such

3. See Appendix for a summary of the issue of the original brief submitted by the WWF-Brazil.



Pamphlets issued by the MSIA in Brazil, exposing the plot to internationalize the Amazon.

effect. That imprudence might, and, speaking morally, probably should become the instrument of WWF-Brazil's undoing.

By its choice of that form of its argument in its own brief, the issue for WWF, is that the relevant facts published by MSIA happen to be known to WWF as true facts and, as the contortions of the WWF brief implicitly attest, by its legal counsel, too. This condition is reflected in the fact, that WWF evades its obligation to muster evidence which addresses seriously and rationally the issue of the truthfulness of the content of those MSIA documents against which it complains. In short, WWF-Brazil argues for a summary, pre-emptive, virtually final decision gagging the future truthful speech of the defendants, that by an action which is premised essentially on the Appellant's own exhibition of systemically and willfully reckless disregard for truth.

Instead of seeking to present some truthful evidence in support of its attacks on the factual content of the MSIA publications, WWF-Brazil makes the burden of its complaint its own insistence, that the MSIA has been very effective politically, in securing widespread acceptance of the truthfulness of its heretofore published, relevant documents. The

WWF demands that the publication of those facts, which it has so far declined to refute with truthful evidence as to matters of fact, must be suppressed, that solely on the grounds, asserted by WWF itself, that the MSIA's facts, whose truthfulness it has not challenged factually, have more or less effectively discredited WWF's political cause in Brazil's public market-place for ideas. That logic of the construction of WWF's argument, reminds us of the old quip about the fellow who killed his parents and then sought clemency from the court, as an orphan.

There, in the most significant of the symptomatic features of WWF's own briefs, we are presented with the nub of the most immediate issue in that case.⁴

Thus, to summarize the issues of that case, the essential feature of WWF's legal intervention is the following.

As just described, WWF-Brazil has not only conceded, but laid heavy emphasis on the point, that the MSIA has gained wide and largely successful circulation of a number of printed publications documenting the leading issues involving the international WWF and its network of accomplices.⁵ These publications have radiated throughout many of the leading channels of Brazil's influential state, scientific, and other strata, to the point, that many of those circles have reached the conclusion that WWF's policies are both largely false as to fact, and represent a clear and present threat to the welfare of Brazil as a sovereign nation.

When the WWF briefs are read in the light of the actual content and successful impact of those MSIA publications, WWF's court actions are those of an organization which has described itself, in its own briefs, as in danger of losing any continuation of the relevant public policy-debate. It claims that it is therefore desperately in need of aid in the form of repressive official measures, to accomplish an end which it could not achieve by honest practice of reason and fact presented according to due process in the market-place of ideas, but only by pre-emptive decree akin in spirit to the legal philosophy of the notorious Carl Schmitt, as Schmitt's doctrine was employed in establishing the Nazi dictatorship on February 28, 1933.

Meanwhile, in Australia

Comparing the actions of WWF Brazil with the related action in Australia, makes the point still clearer.

In both Brazil and Australia, one among the leading strategies used by the anti-technology, neo-Malthusian NGOs and kindred associations, has been to exploit the name of "indigenous peoples" as a way of conduiting enormous tracts of land containing natural resources, out from under the control of the nation and its elected government, and into the hands, in fact, of private multinational interests contracting with the

representatives of the so-called "indigenous peoples." We should compare this, with what is being done, aided by mercenary armies, in takeovers of large tracts of mineral resources in Brazil's neighbor, war-torn sub-Sahara Africa.

In Australia, it is that use of the "indigenous peoples" variant of the general WWF line, which is the strategy in the attacks upon my associates by the Australia Anti-Defamation Commission, Inc. (ADC), a privately controlled entity whose relevant Board of Advisors includes four members of the British Privy Council. These are, the Right Honorable Sir Zelman Cowen, Knight Grand Cross of the Order of St. Michael and St. George; the Right Honorable Malcolm Fraser, former Liberal Prime Minister; the Right Honorable Bob Hawke, former Labor Prime Minister; and, the Right Honorable Ninian Stephen, a former Governor-General, and Knight Grand Cross of the Order of St. Michael and St. George. Those titles of these gentlemen have a special relevance, because Queen Elizabeth II is the sovereign of not only the United Kingdom, but also Canada, Australia, and certain additional member-states of the British Commonwealth (not quite yet including the U.S.A. as a royal satrapy).

Thus, in the tradition of the British East India Company as once represented by Lord Shelburne, we have the agents of an imperial form of political rule, employing entities which are, in turn, its agents, either as nominally private mercenary armies, or other forms of private associations, as instruments of, first, furthering the personal whims of the imperial ruling family under private covers, and, secondly, denying the ruling family's accountability for the actions it so fosters.

ADC's current propaganda concentrates on attacking a certain Tony Drake's candidacy for Senate in Western Australia. ADC, in its complaint, complains that my associates depict "Aboriginal land rights as a 'fraud concocted by Prince Philip' to splinter Australia," and identify Drake as linked to me, through the Australia Citizens Electoral Council (CEC). ADC complains that Drake issued a 1998 public statement, stating that "The Citizens Electoral Council derives its credibility from the fact that we alone among Australian political institutions have for four years issued repeated warnings based on the economic forecast of Lyndon LaRouche that the world's financial system and monetary system would collapse."

The attack upon Drake and the CEC by ADC has been widely reported by the Australian Broadcasting Corporation, and other radio broadcasts in Western Australia.


The connections of the ADC itself cast additional light on the background for the sundry WWF and related hysteria against me at this time. Typical are the ADC and related connections of Canada's Edgar Bronfman, a one-time booster of East Germany's Honecker regime. The following documentation, not only gives additional exposure to evidence of the fraudulent disregard for truth by WWF's actions on those two continents, but points to the nature of the influence which the British Commonwealth's (Canada's) Edgar Bronfman et al. have exerted within Australia through channels associated with ADC.

4. See Appendix.

5. Two pamphlets, "The Green Mafia Attacks the Waterways," 5,000 of which had been printed in 1998, and "Roraima at the Center of the Internationalization of the Amazon," printed in November 1999, with a run of 15,000.

FIGURE 2

The Queen's 'Indigenous' Control Over Australia's Raw Materials



Sources: Department of Primary Industries and Energy 1997; Bureau of Resource Sciences; Minerals Council of Australia.

The Queen's mining cartel, led by Rio Tinto, Funds Aboriginal "land rights" in order to lock up Australia's vast mineral wealth.

Bronfman's role in this is better understood when we recall British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's frenzied attempt to prevent the reunification of Germany, an attempt which came prominently to the surface early during the 1989-1990 crisis of the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies. However, efforts by her government, and related attitudes by France's President François Mitterrand to similar effect, were already evident before the eruption of the Eastern Europe crises of 1989. There are certain strategic developments of a related nature, which bear in an important way upon the issues posed by the cited Brazil and Australia developments.

On pages 54-55 of its Jan. 11, 1991 issue, *EIR* published

a report entitled, "Bronfman Colluded with Communists." This report, by *EIR's* Jeffrey Steinberg, cited a Dec. 21, 1990 *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (FAZ)* article by Michael Wolffsohn, quoting from former German Democratic Republic (D.D.R.) Foreign Ministry files on years-long collusion between Edgar Bronfman and his WWF associates with the D.D.R. regime, including Honecker, ex-Foreign Minister Oskar Fischer, and Foreign Ministry U.S.A. Department head Herbert Barth. Citing minutes from an Oct. 17, 1988 meeting in East Berlin, between Bronfman and Honecker, and subsequent meetings between Fischer and Dr. Maram Stern, World Jewish Council (WJC) representative to the D.D.R., that arti-



Canada's Edgar Bronfman, the one-time booster of East Germany's Honecker regime, is a point-man for British Commonwealth influence internationally.

cle, authored by notable journalist Wolffsohn, detailed the ongoing role of Bronfman as mediator between East Berlin and Washington, a role dating at least to 1985.

On Oct. 17, 1988, five days after my nationally televised press conference held in Berlin, where I had pre-announced, in significant detail, and great accuracy, some crucial and detailed features of the imminent collapse of the Soviet economic system and probable early reunification of Germany, Bronfman was awarded the Gold Star of People's Friendship, the highest civilian honor, by Honecker, in person. The Wolffsohn article, cited in *EIR*, quoted from a *Newsweek* magazine interview with Bronfman, two weeks after the D.D.R. award ceremony, calling for East Germany to be given Most Favored Nation status by the U.S. government, and calling for Honecker to be invited to the White House for a state visit. Just over a year later, the East Germany regime of Bronfman crony Erich Honecker collapsed, and Germany moved toward reunification, despite Mrs. Thatcher's characteristically ill-tempered objections to such developments.

In *EIR*'s Aug. 19, 1994, edition, under the title of "Thirty Years of Collusion Between the ADL and Stasi," Jeffrey Steinberg detailed four case studies of ADL and Bronfman collusion with East German intelligence, including: 1) the Eichmann trial; 2) intensifying the 'Nazi hunt;' 3) the 'Get LaRouche' task force; 4) Shabtai Kalmanowitch. On Kalmanowitch, the *EIR* story cited another Michael Wolffsohn article, appearing in the June 28, 1994 *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, detailing the role of Alexander Schalck-Golodkowski in financing the spy swap that freed Kalmanowitch.

The subject here is not Bronfman's policies and actions as they might be only narrowly considered. The subject is the British monarchy's policy, as it may or may not coincide, from time to time, with particular actions by Bronfman. The issue is the role of the British monarchy's actions toward the goal of bringing about the dismemberment, or even dissolu-

tion, through aid of "ecological" and "indigenous peoples" gambits, of nation-states such as Brazil and Australia, among many others. The related issue is the use of methods, such as in the instance of the promotion of the recently accelerated threat of a new Middle East war, which latter has come about as a consequence of that monarchy's policies and actions.

The monarchy's Middle East policy has been essentially continuous since the early days of the Napoleonic wars, when its long-range intentions respecting the break-up of the Ottoman Empire, began a British centuries-long double game, of British-backed gang versus British-backed counter-gang, throughout the Middle East region as a whole. The London-directed creation of the body which became the "Young Turk" regime, is but one, very significant aspect of this history. The way in which London has concocted the presently continuing, decades-long Israeli-Palestinian conflict, since the Jewish settlers' defense against the attacks led by the pro-Nazi Grand Mufti, is reflected, today, as a pivotal feature of current Anglo-American geopolitical concoctions for Asia and North Africa as a whole.

At the present moment, the respective and overlapping intentions of the new U.S. administration and London, on the matter of exploiting, strategically, the potential for a new Middle East war, is a center-piece of the strategic policies of relevant factions among governments, policies reflecting the way in which the deployment of the WWF and related assets will be folded into what putatively mad Zbigniew Brzezinski's Samuel P. Huntington has defined as his geopolitical scheme for a "Clash of Civilizations" between the Islamic world and "the West."

The repercussions of the presently threatened outbreak of Israeli attacks upon Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, and Iran, in addition to the Palestinians, with or without "Desert Storm"-like roles of the military forces from NATO, will largely determine the way in which strategic cultural subversion is deployed, globally, through aid of such elements of the world's landscape as WWF.

In this and related matters, the customary silliness of most leading journalists and others, about such strategic factors, must be put aside. A new Middle East war of the general type and implications indicated, will occur or not, whether or not certain specified incidents materialize. It will occur only if the combination of the Israeli government and certain Anglo-American circles wish to have it occur. If they should wish it to occur, the incidents to "explain" that occurrence, will be arranged, just as the Hitler regime concocted the incidents used as the pretext for the invasion of Poland.

Contrary to widespread childish opinion, most of the important things that happen in the world, happen because powerful forces intend them to happen, not because of some so-called "sociological" or other merely statistical coincidence of the types reported for the popular edification of the easily deluded. The new Bush Administration wishes to settle accounts with Iraq, in memory of the passions of former Prime

Minister Margaret Thatcher and former U.S. President George Bush. As long as that remains a prevalent Anglo-American intention, a new Middle East war, bigger than any yet seen, is more or less inevitable under presently reigning global influences, whether or not any significant number of Israeli or Islamic leaders wish it to occur.

The Case of ‘Teddy’ Goldsmith

To better understand the importance of the facts I have just outlined, consider a related current development, and some of its relevant background.

At the same time as the referenced attacks from WWF-Brazil and Australia, there has been a relevant, ongoing operation, targetting Brazil from Pôrto Alegre, led by the Edward “Teddy” Goldsmith, the brother of the late Sir Jimmy Goldsmith, and former, 1950s, witting, Paris-based collaborator of both Stephen Spender and a figure who later became an old adversary of mine from the 1983-1984 days of the launching of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). That adversary is “Teddy” Goldsmith’s old crony from Paris days: spooky New York banker John Train.

Whereas, WWF and related neo-Malthusian organizations, are among the chief world-wide arms of the effort to bring about the extermination of the sovereign nation-state throughout this planet, through “globalization,” “Teddy” Goldsmith is a central figure of a riotous collection of so-called “activists” following in the tradition of the British Foreign Office’s Jeremy Bentham from the terrorist days of Robespierre, Danton, and Marat. This rabble is deployed in protesting impotently, if with some proclivity for violence, against “globalization.” Goldsmith acts, not to the effect of defeating globalization, but, rather, ensuring its success, by deploying to take control of the opposition to globalization, pre-emptively, out of the hands of what might otherwise emerge as the leading opposition.

After considering Goldsmith’s background and his family’s spooky connections over decades, one may be disgusted, but not honestly surprised, by the suspicious, Jacobin-like, leftist rabble-rouser role, being played by the followers of veteran British-French-American spook Goldsmith, in places such as Seattle, Pôrto Alegre, and other parts of the world. His involvement at Pôrto Alegre during this time-frame, happens to be, at this moment, among the most politically significant of his spooky countergang escapades currently, this time directly threatening to destabilize the government of Brazil.

To appreciate the significance of Goldsmith’s personal appearance in that context, the following background should prove most helpful. *EIR* has followed Goldsmith’s role closely and carefully, over the years.

The Feb. 1, 1991 *EIR*, pp. 20-25, “John Train, *Paris Review*, and the ‘Get LaRouche’ Gang,” by Scott Thompson, detailed the 1950s *Paris Review* nexus involving John Train, W.H. Auden, Stephen Spender, Aldous Huxley, Jimmy Goldsmith, Edward (“Teddy”) Goldsmith, and Saddrudin Aga

Khan. Teddy Goldsmith’s wife at the time, Gillian Marion Pretty, was editorial assistant to Train at *Paris Review*.

Another report by Scott Thompson, in an Oct. 28, 1994 *EIR* article, “The Train/Goldsmith Nexus,” reported that Saddrudin Aga Khan, publisher of *Paris Review* during the heyday of Train et al., is a member of Prince Philip’s 1001 Club, funding arm of WWF. A later Scott Thompson report, logged an interview conducted with Teddy Goldsmith, in which he personally confirmed ties to John Train dating back to the 1950s *Paris Review* epoch, adding that his brother (and funder of his own *The Ecologist* magazine), “Iran-Contra” days Vice-President George Bush associate Sir Jimmy Goldsmith, remained in “almost weekly contact” with John Train up to that time.

New York banker John Train played a crucial role in a 1982-1984 effort, initiated, at the persistent instigation of former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, to launch a U.S. “secret government” operation against me and my associates under the foreign intelligence operations provision of U.S. Executive Order 12333 and related provisions. According to official U.S. government records which have been released, this action by Kissinger was first launched during the Summer of 1982, following a keynote address delivered publicly at a London Chatham House conference on May 10, 1982.

It was in this setting, that former British Foreign Minister Lord Peter Carrington acted to assist the subsequently royally knighted Kissinger, in the formation of a lucrative venture known as Kissinger Associates, Inc. It was in this and related circumstances that Kissinger, in August 1982, wrote a letter, demanding a special operation against me. During January 1983, Kissinger’s demand was authorized through a rump session of the official President’s Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (PFIAB), and immediately set into motion that same month.

In the context of that E.O. 12333 action, a combined task-force of both public and private intelligence and news-media capabilities, was put into operation, in support of the project set up by Kissinger’s insistence. John Train, beginning about April 1983, set up a salon on the premises of his New York City office, during which he brought together a group of intelligence operatives and press representatives for the purpose of coordinating a 12333-style operation, in cooperation with agencies including NBC-TV and the *Wall Street Journal*, among numerous others. Most of the defamation circulated by leading U.S. television and print media during 1983-1984, and later, was orchestrated through participants in the meetings of that salon. Most of the defamatory propaganda against me and my associates, which is circulated, through major news media, and others, against me internationally, and also legal actions targetting me and my associates, has had its origin in the still never-ended collaboration between official and other activities associated in an exemplary way with that Kissinger-prompted action, and with that salon.

Similarly, “Teddy” Goldsmith’s operations, as in Pôrto



EIR's covers chronicle our ongoing battle with the House of Windsor.

Alegre, have, to the present day, the characteristics of a high-level intelligence operation of a type traceable to the nature of Anglo-French and American activities around the “witting” *Paris Review* of the 1950s. In this light, the French connections of Goldsmith’s operations targetting Brazil today, coincide with the intention of some to bring down the present government of Brazil.⁶

Brazil, the last major point of resistance to British Commonwealth-initiated, NAFTA-style globalization of all of Central and South America, is one of the key nations on the current list of leading targets of so-called “environmentalist” and related pro-globalization projects world-wide. Goldsmith’s influence within Brazil’s political life is notable under such circumstances.

Consider some typical related earlier actions by WWF against us, and how we responded to them.

EIR, Nov. 25, 1994, pp. 30-32, “EIR Goes Toe to Toe Against the House of Windsor,” by Carlos Wesley, and “Geneva Gatherings Will Fund WWF Mass Murder,” by Our Special Correspondent, contains details of the WWF reaction to the initial release of *EIR*’s “Coming Fall of the House of Windsor,” Special Report edition. The Oct. 30, 1994 edition of *People*, a London weekly with circulation of 5 million, reported that the *EIR* study “compares Philip with Hitler and brands him a mass murderer who is plotting to stamp out Africa’s ‘darker complexioned peoples.’ . . . The WWF was staggered at the attack on Philip and the charity.” To call

WWF a “charity,” is a very charitable characterization, indeed.

WWF public affairs executive Dana West had said: “It’s just nonsense. We are helping people in Africa—not killing them. It’s laughable. We’ve never even heard of this organization,” she lied. The *EIR* article noted that WWF had earlier threatened, explicitly, to sue *EIR*, obviously not an organization unknown to WWF.

The same *EIR* article reported that on Nov. 16, 1994, the Australian Labor Party government of Prime Minister Paul Keating threatened to deport *EIR* editor Webster Tarpley, to prevent a news conference by Tarpley at the National Press Club in the capital of Canberra on the release of the *EIR* “Coming Fall of the House of Windsor.”

A second *EIR* article, “Geneva Gatherings Will Fund WWF Mass Murder,” detailed a large fundraiser for WWF in Geneva, Switzerland, on Nov. 28, 1994. Sponsors of the event, to feature a speech by Prince Philip, included: Coutts private bank, Kleinwort Benson, British Bank of the Middle East, Pictet and Lombard Odier banks, Swiss Omega and Rolex watch companies, Edmond Safra, and Mr. and Mrs. Edgar Picciotto, of Union Bancaire Privée. Picciotto is involved in GeoPol, a Swiss think tank, implicated in anti-LaRouche operations conducted via a certain Laurent Murawiec, a real-life “Beetlebaum” of the legendary mythical horse-race, and a hand-me-down political carcass, currently in the possession of institutions of a peculiar odor.

EIR’s June 19, 1998 cover story, contains a report entitled “Prince Philip’s Minions Lash Out Against LaRouche,” pp. 40-43, detailing certain of the London *Telegraph*’s published attacks on LaRouche associates, over the linking of Prince Philip to the death of Princess Diana.

In an *EIR* Aug. 13, 1999 cover story, one is reminded of

6. The track of the Goldsmiths, Train, et al. intersects the network of Paul Rivet, Jacques Soustelle, and Jean de Menil, in sundry operations over the period from the 1930s into the 1960s targetting of Charles de Gaulle and others by these circles. All three of the later, as most of the leading Permindex figures, are now deceased, but the legacy continues.

a published item bearing the title, "The Queen on LaRouche: 'Shut That Man's Mouth!'" The item features details of a *Take a Break* libel against LaRouche, by Katie Fraser, noting that Buckingham Palace has become "increasingly alarmed" at LaRouche activities, quoting an unnamed palace source that LaRouche represents "the biggest threat ever to the reputation of the Queen worldwide . . . Something has to be done." The article quotes another commentator, "It is vital to protect the Queen as a symbol of decency in a sometimes wicked world. She is a figurehead for all that is good about Britain. That must be protected at all costs." One was left to wonder what "at all costs" is intended to mean.

To understand that British monarchy, one must take into account the fact, that it was originally the Eighteenth-Century creation of an association known to Eighteenth-Century Europe as "the Venetian Party," which used the House of Hanover and its royal descendants, as Venice had, earlier, used so many among the old Norman occupiers of England, France, Sicily, and elsewhere. It is a British monarchy originally selected for the same general purpose for which Venice had formerly selected its Doges.

The ruling oligarchy of the United Kingdom mimics the financier oligarchical families of old Venice. That Kingdom requires an agency, in this case the monarchy, to hold its heteronomic ranks together as a unified force, against both the population of the British isles in general, and also as much of the larger world as it might gather into its imperial roster of colonies, satrapies, and World Bank dependencies. Thus, the Queen, as head of state for several individual Commonwealth-member nations, and *primus inter pares* for the Commonwealth as a whole, has, like a Venetian Doge of yore, relatively tremendous, including arbitrary powers and privileges, if chiefly within the scope of the imperial monarchy's globally far-flung state apparatus and associated custom as such.⁷

This power is conditional, in the sense that a loss of the monarchy's image of authority in and among the victims of that affliction known as British public opinion, might lead to the toppling of the tiresome royal house itself. Yet, at the same time, the oligarchy, especially its explicitly financier component, and the Commonwealth, too, require the existence of the monarchy as an institution, to hold the inherently heteronomic tendencies among the oligarchy, the kingdom, and the Commonwealth together. Not so unified, divided, their unity would easily collapse.

The key issue of law involved in that role of the monarchy, is the concept sometimes identified as "shareholder interest." Unless there is some powerful authority, to compel a people to give up modern society's inclination that government must efficiently promote the general welfare of all of the nation's current population and posterity alike, and must also promote those institutions of government on which defense of the gen-

eral welfare depends absolutely, the rapacious claims of an arbitrary "shareholder interest," could not compel a people to abandon the self-defense of its general welfare.

Herein lies the dependency of the world's presently hegemonic financier oligarchy on a combination of the British monarchy-led Anglo-American financier interest, and the destruction, through "globalization," of the authority of those forms of sovereign government, to which a people might turn, in a time of crisis, for defense of the people and nation against rapacious "shareholder interest," as we see an example of this in the California energy crisis today. Hence, the power of the monarchy lies in the symbiotic dependency of the intrinsically anarchic impulse of "shareholder interest," upon the role of arbitrary power represented by the monarchy.

As I shall indicate in the closing section of this present report, it is precisely that characteristic feature of the British monarchy which now threatens it with the prospect of extinction by its own hand. Pending that concluding observation, I continue with my summary description of the apparent characteristics of that monarchy at this instant.

As a consequence of this disgusting symbiosis, which some may consider reminiscent of a caddis-fly's pupal state, among royal house, financier oligarchy, and the generality of the population, the monarchy exerts a powerful grip upon the kingdom, throughout the Commonwealth, and intruding into the world at large. What holds the whole mess together, is an ideology expressing the interdependency of these elements. The sticky stuff which keeps these assorted elements tied to one another, is the mortal advantages and pleasures which the participants share, that through the predominantly predatory role enjoyed by the slime-mold-like concoction as a whole.

Reduced to essentials, Queen Elizabeth II today has a certain ominously ironical resemblance to the Babylonian figure popularly known as Belshazzar. In performing that role, like doomed tyrannies of ancient Mesopotamia, the Delphi cult of the Pythian Apollo, and ancient pagan Rome, the Queen is, essentially, like the Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte or disgusting Napoleon III, or Benito Mussolini, a *Romantic* figure, in the literal sense of that term.

That monarchy is a modern expression of what was known to ancient Greeks and others as "the oligarchical model" of society, in which some people, and their armed and other lackeys, herd, use, and cull a mass of subjects maintained, as the most numerous class, that of virtual human cattle, with aid of sundry measures of the kind of population-control outlined in Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger's pro-genocidal, 1974 NSSM-200 and President Jimmy Carter's population-control policies.

To understand that royal house, and such associates as the neo-Malthusian World Wide Fund for Nature, it is sufficient to think of historical precedents such as that arrangement among the Spartans and their helots, as the Lycurgan code was conceived by the Delphi Apollo cult, or the slave-owning Confederate States of America, and the latter's tradition of so-called "shareholder interest" continued today. That topic

7. A monarchy which claims sovereignty over a number of nations simultaneously is nothing but an empire.

is key to defining the orbit in which objects such as the World Wide Fund for Nature are moved, that according to the intention of the oligarchical principle.

2. Now, Study the Orbit Itself

The foregoing points taken into account, we have come to the crucial issue: why that monarchy is doomed, at least in its present form, carrying to its doom, like a sinking *Titanic*, anyone wrapped in its continued embrace.

As in all similar attacks upon me from British quarters, by the Mont Pelerin Society and others, during more than a score years, the charges circulated against me and my associates, which have been made by foregoing types of sources, are either pure and simple lies, or other expressions of willfully reckless and malicious disregard for truth. Nonetheless, behind that royal bodyguard of lies, there are real issues, some of them issues of great importance for humanity as a whole.

It is on account of those real issues, as distinct from the lying propaganda of those adversaries of mine, that the inauguration of President George W. Bush appears to have been taken by those royal and related interests as the opportunity for making me, personally, once again as during the 1980s, a principal, and most consistent choice of target of their malice, as expressed throughout diverse regions of this planet. Some of the shrewder such opponents, hate me because they fear that I am accurate in my forecaster's outlook on the current situation. Other opponents hate me, because my warnings threaten to shatter their desire for the consolations of blind faith in the their current religious or other wishful delusions; these latter, are typified by that referenced British tabloid which headlined its attack, "Shut This Man's Mouth!"

However, there is a deeper issue, which is reflected by that pagan religious quality of "fundamentalist" belief, which is expressed by neo-Malthusian cults such as the World Wide Fund for Nature. Here lies the key to recognizing the present British monarchy's propensity for impending self-inflicted doom.

Prince Philip: Man or Beast?

So, considering the arguments of my adversaries from among certain of that monarchy's accomplices, the Queen's Consort would appear to believe, that I, as a professed and practicing human being, am thus a representative of a species which is superior to that lower form of life which he, Philip Mountbatten, has repeatedly claimed himself to represent.

Lest any person receiving my report, might be so naive as to suspect that my immediately preceding statement is exaggerated on any point, the following summarizes the most relevant evidence bearing upon the two incidents, those, in Brazil and Australia, just identified above. This report has identified but a sampling of the decades-long pattern of those incidents which indicate that the attacks upon me and my associates

from actual or otherwise avowed representatives of that monarchy, are but various threads of the same continuing cloth.

I include a summary of the proofs, that, in both the recent and some earlier comparable cases, the issues raised by the actions of the Prince's sundry relevant supporters and agents, center on a conflict, that between me and those, among adversaries who claim to represent a different species, Princes Philip and Bernhard. On the one side, there is the human species, as defended by me; and, on the opposing side, there is the WWF, which acts in service of its often expressed conviction, that mankind is just another form of beast, fit only to be ruled by beastly predators, its population used, herded, hunted, or culled, as beastly cattle might be.

The existence of that difference in belief and practice, is no mere matter of opinion. Since the first emergence of the modern sovereign nation-state as an institution, during the course of Europe's Fifteenth-Century Renaissance, all of modern, globally extended European civilization has been divided between two principles. One of these has been, since Europe's Fifteenth-Century, Italy-pivoted Renaissance, the modern nation-state, which is premised upon the constitutional principle of service to the *general welfare* of all of the population, as typified by the opening three paragraphs of the 1776 U.S. Declaration of Independence and the Preamble of the Constitution of the U.S.A. The opposing, more ancient principle, is the modern continuation of the ancient, pre-modern, oligarchical model, for which the British monarchy is the leading expression on this planet today.

The issues set forth in the opening paragraphs of the 1776 U.S. Declaration of Independence and the Preamble of the 1789 Federal Constitution, express the unbridgeable gulf separating the principle of a modern sovereign nation-state republic from an oligarchy of such forms as the British monarchy.

Inside the U.S.A. itself, the sometimes mortal conflict between republican patriots and pro-monarchy, pro-oligarchical American Tories, has been that division of opinion respecting the nature of the human individual.

The patriot's view, gave political expression to the Christian view of the Mosaic principle, that man and woman are made equally in the image of the Creator of the universe, and empowered, and also obliged, to rule over all lower forms of life in that universe, for their own benefit.

The American Tory's pro-monarchy view expressed the pro-oligarchical view which has persisted into modern times, since ancient Babylon, the Delphi cult of the Pythian Apollo, pagan Rome, and the Confederate States of America, and is premised upon the presumption of both doctrine and practice, that, contrary to that Christian principle, some men, as rulers, may use, herd, or cull other persons, as virtually human cattle, to whatever those rulers perceive to be their pleasure in adopted perception of self-interest.

In the earliest history of the United States, this American Tory view was expressed most efficiently by the followers of

the British empiricism of Francis Bacon, Thomas Hobbes, and John Locke. From the beginning of U.S. independence and the debate impinging upon adoption of its Federal Constitution, the Tory view was centered in circles such as those of New England's Judge Lowell and the slaveholders, especially those of the Federal States of Georgia and South Carolina.

At later times in our national history, the pro-oligarchical view came to be centered in circles and followers of the perennially treasonous Aaron Burr, the agent of the British Foreign Office's Jeremy Bentham, who founded the Bank of Manhattan. Burr and his legacy, united Wall Street, the New England drug-trafficking partners of the British East India Company drug-trafficking interests, and the rabidly Anglophile slaveholder of the slave states. Today, that degraded, anti-Christian, anti-Mosaic view respecting the nature of the human species, is expressed, systemically, by the alliance of Wall Street-centered "shareholder interest" with the pro-Confederacy tradition mustered by Republican Presidential candidate Richard Nixon's so-called "Southern Strategy" of his 1966-1968 election-campaigns.

Admittedly, because of that division of European civilization, between two opposing currents, even without such attacks upon me from sources such as the World Wildlife Fund, I, as a U.S. patriot, could not be other than a political and philosophical adversary of that monarchy. My own historic opposition to the British monarchy and the American Tories and Confederacy's legacy, not only as a candidate for election to be a President of the United States, but in every other way, since childhood, has always been, as I have said, the same difference with the British monarchy and American Tory legacy, expressed by every fully witting, patriotic President of the United States, such as John Quincy Adams, Abraham Lincoln, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, since the opening three paragraphs of the 1776 U.S. Declaration of Independence and the Preamble of the Federal Constitution. My views and action express thus what is sometimes called "the American intellectual tradition."

There are three principal causes for that difference between my standpoint and what the Queen's admirer and benefactor, Henry A. Kissinger, has described as the motive for his own hatred for what he has described as "the American intellectual tradition."⁸ My patriotism, is the first of three issues posed by the recurring attacks upon me from the circles of Princes Philip and Bernhard.

The second, related issue, is typified by my hatred against Malthusianism, as that has been expressed by such official documents as Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger's progenocidal 1974 NSSM-200. This, in and of itself, is an immediate issue to be recognized in connection with the most recent

attacks upon me. Admittedly, although the monarchy's recent revival of its hateful Malthusian dogma, is an issue in itself, there is nothing in its neo-Malthusian rantings which is philosophically inconsistent with the legacy of such past British notables as Lord Shelburne and Jeremy Bentham, or Bertrand Russell and H. G. Wells more recently.

Thirdly, there is the issue of those who not only advocate neo-Malthusian policies and practices launched world-wide, by the two princes and their lackeys, or the presently leading circles of the International Monetary Fund and World Bank, but who also use their influence on governments and other powerful forces, to force Malthusian and kindred pro-oligarchical policies on individual nations, as "conditionalities," and upon powerful international authorities as well.

Despite the fact that those three points of conflict, either are, or underlie the only true and significant differences between that Queen and me, none of her family's public advocates, past or present, have presented any pertinent evidence in support of their recurring actions against me, but have relied, instead, as in the referenced Brazil and Australia cases, upon statements readily exposed as being a mixture of outright lies and willfully reckless disregard for readily and copiously available true facts. For proof of that pattern of lying in their attacks, I rely upon extensive relevant documentation which my associates have maintained in our journalists' files over the greater part of three decades to date.

Now, as the Biblical prophet Jonah warned the men and women of Nineveh, the very highest court, that of history, is moving to remove from power that which that monarchy represents, *in one way or another*. On that account, now consider the relationship between those three issues and that tragic flaw within the monarchy, which impels it, like Hamlet, toward its evidently chosen, self-induced doom. I expand somewhat on the summary of the three issues just stated.

The Three Strategic Issues Posed

In considering the repressive actions taken against me by agents of Britain's Prince Philip and the Netherlands' Prince Bernhard, we have, thus, the three referenced, overlapping, but nonetheless distinct issues to take into account in somewhat greater detail.

The first issue of the British monarchy's personal quarrel with me, is the fact, already referenced. Historically, that monarchy has been the consistently avowed enemy of the principles upon which the United States was founded, since before the 1776 U.S. Declaration of Independence, until the current day. It has sought to crush my republic at the outset, in which attempt it failed, as Prince Metternich's Holy Alliance did, also. It tried to tear my republic apart, through backing the Confederate States of America, as Lord Palmerston attempted, but was defeated by President Lincoln's leadership. It has sought to destroy us by its corrupting embrace, as it has acted since the assassination of our President William McKinley, to the present day. For a time, during the past

8. Henry A. Kissinger, "Reflections on a Partnership: British and American Attitudes to Postwar Foreign Policy, Address in Commemoration of the Bicentenary of the Office of Foreign Secretary," May 10, 1982, Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House), London.

century, those enemies were defeated by the leadership of President Franklin Roosevelt's return of the nation to its principle of the promotion of the general welfare, and might have been turned back by the assassinated President Kennedy, had he lived. More recently, during the recent thirty-five years, the pro-racist, so-called Southern Strategy, and the related "fiscal conservatism" and "free trade" fads, has been used by the American Tory tradition, in a fresh attempt to destroy this republic.

Those efforts to destroy my nation, are not merely schemes. Like the attacks of the jackal or hyena upon its intended prey, the quarrel which that monarchy has with both my republic and with me, expresses the deeply rooted character of that species which the monarchy of the United Kingdom has claimed itself as representing, from the start to the present day.

Notably, those who share the American Tory outlook in the U.S. today, including all of those morally depraved strata which are politically committed to the supremacy of neo-Malthusian and shareholder-value dogmas, represent, in their practice, a continuation of the tradition of those treasonously inclined adversaries of the principle of the general welfare during the American War for Independence and the defense of our republic against the Confederacy. This puts all of the patriots of the republican cause, world-wide, into principled opposition to the nature and practice of the British monarchy. The issue of that conflict is nothing less significant, than two mortally opposing views of the nature of the individual member of the human species. Hence, the form of that global conflict has the form of mortal strife between what are self-defined, functionally, as two irreconcilably different species.

The currently reigning British royal family, represents, as such a species-type, that tradition of the bloody tyrant, William of Orange, which was known, during the Eighteenth Century, as "The Venetian Party." It is a party which had dominated the English monarchy, recurrently, since such agents of Venice as Cardinal Pole, Francesco Zorzi, and Thomas Cromwell, had seduced King Henry VIII and beheaded the sainted Sir Thomas More. From about the time of the death of Queen Anne and the ouster from England of the Gottfried Leibniz otherwise intended to serve as England's first minister, the present monarchy, in its self-defined character as a species-type, has defined the nature of both the Kingdom and the Empire.

This legacy of William of Orange's "Venetian Party," has thus dominated the present British monarchy since the coronation of George I. It is a monarchy selected to serve as presiding head of state in the interest of an imperial form of financier-oligarchical caste. On that account, the conflict between that monarchy and my republic, has always been of an incurable, systemic nature, a conflict between species of society which are natural adversaries by birth.

We human beings, as creatures of free will, have the power to improve, even greatly change our character. How-

ever, as the Biblical Jonah warned Nineveh, unless we exercise that free will, to make such improvements in a timely way, our fate is less often the outcome of what we might imagine our goals to be, than what our character causes us to bring upon ourselves, whether we are conscious of that connection or not.

Such is the tragic flaw so nakedly displayed by the newly inaugurated Bush Administration, which it shares, in large degree with the British monarchy.

The second issue of that monarchy's quarrel with me, its Malthusianism, is expressed in the fact, that, since no later than 1973, the accomplices Princes Philip and Bernhard, have used their positions as contemporary, royal representatives of that Anglo-Dutch Venetian Party, to introduce global measures of population control which, if not prevented, would plunge this entire planet into a new dark age for all humanity.

This awful belief, whether it is called "Malthusianism," "neo-Malthusianism," "environmentalism," or "ecology," is derived from, and expresses a pro-oligarchical view of each and all members of the human species, as "no better than a beast," as Prince Philip does. Such views, the same from which Adolf Hitler's Nazi regime derived its legal doctrine of "useless eaters," under the rubric of "eugenics," are the leading practical expression of today's global conflict between two mortally opposing views on the nature of the human species.

The third issue, is that the proponents of these personal attacks, not only upon me and my friends, but also on entire nations, are liars of the sort not content to rob and kill their victims, but who must defame them, too, as they have lied so persistently in deploying their lackeys to defame me and my associates, world-wide, during recent decades.

On this account, their legal practice differs in no point of principle from that of either U.S. Supreme Court Associate Justice Antonin Scalia, or of the Carl Schmitt from whose doctrine the legal coup d'état establishing the Hitler dictatorship was derived. The argument typical of the ideologues of the World Wide Fund for Nature, that they have the right inhering in their arbitrary irrational choice of belief, to destroy the economic and political foundations of all of the leading achievements of modern European civilization, for the sake of their so-called ecological revolution, differs in no important respect from that derived, in the tradition of the right-wing fanatic G.W.F. Hegel's theory of the state, by Carl Schmitt, to impose the dictatorial *Notverordnung* of Feb. 28, 1933, which unleashed World War II as its lawful consequence.

Of these three strategic issues, one is most fundamental: their actions as adversaries of the well-being of the human species as a whole. While the evidence bearing on the other two issues must be included, it is the attack on the welfare of present and future generations of my species which is the essential issue.

The tragic flaws of the Bush Presidency and the British monarchy are related, but otherwise specific to each. The

common feature of those flaws, is, as I have stressed above, that neither has an efficient conception of that principle of law known to modern society by the names of general welfare and common good. It is the hostility of each to that principle, which is the awful tragic flaw underlying both cases. But, there is another aspect to this same matter. As the Disciple Luke writes, if no other agency, the very stones may speak. So, as if behind the motion of such stones, recognize the hand of fate now descending upon the British monarchy.

The Twilight of the Gods

Thus, we come to our concluding point: the threatened extinction of the British monarchy by its own hand. Since I have elaborated that case in its general form, in numerous published locations,⁹ it will be sufficient, on this occasion, to summarize the essentials and situate the British monarchy's fate within that general case.

To understand how a culture may doom itself, even to the point of its self-induced extinction, as ancient Mesopotamian cultures did repeatedly, it is most useful, today, to point to a closely related phenomenon, blind faith in the view of today's conventional financial accounting as a guide to shaping of economic policies of individual firms, even entire economies. The issue is the same as that pointed out by Kepler, in his *The New Astronomy*, in pointing out the absurdity of the method employed by such predecessors as Claudius Ptolemy, Copernicus, and Tycho Brahe. The issue is the same lunacy practiced by the credulous devotees of the teachings of Adam Smith, Friedrich von Hayek, and the American Enterprise Institute. The issue is the folly of relying upon the symbol-minded statistical method known as the childish game of "connect the dots."

In economic reality, the ability of a population to continue to reproduce its numbers in a better condition than earlier, is accomplished solely through the impact of those discoveries derived in the form of experimentally validated universal physical principles, and the technologies derived from such discoveries. Such discoveries have the mathematical form known to the ancient Classical Greeks as *incommensurable* magnitudes.

Kepler recognized, as implicit by the paradoxical, elliptic character of the orbit of Mars, that in a universe in which a continuously non-constant, even non-uniform curvature described the recurring orbital trajectory of a stellar body, that no connect-the-dots scheme, such as that of Copernicus, could account for the way in which the motion of that planet or other body were predetermined. From the consideration of that paradox, Kepler derived his discovery of a universal physical principle of gravitation.

Leibniz's original discovery of the calculus, which Isaac Newton was never able to follow, was developed as a solution

to the type of problem which had been posed by Kepler's discovery of universal gravitation. Leibniz's differential is not the linear interval erroneously proposed by Leonhard Euler, Augustin Cauchy, et al., but an interval of non-uniform curvature, whose corresponding interval defines an orbit of the paradoxical quality recognized by Kepler.

In fact, every experimentally validated universal physical principle has that same specific quality of an incommensurable. That distinct quality, distinct to each such principle, is otherwise known as the characteristic of that principle, or, in the alternative, of the physical-space-time domain associated with a Riemannian manifold of such principles.

In physical production, in which universal principles such as those associated with chemistry, are applied, the connection between the state of affairs before and after the relevant act of production, is not measurable as a straight-line connection of the type seen in the financial accountant's description of that act of production. Thus, there is a systemic, sometimes economically fatal, difference between cost accounting analysis of production and the physical reality of the cause-effect relations reflected.

In production, the net gain, in excess of total costs of production incurred by the entire society, is ultimately the result of applied technologies which are derived from discoveries of universal physical principles. Thus, to sum up the case, the cause of the difference between costs of production and the output of successful production, is a pathway of physical action which is mathematically of the form of an incommensurable, an incommensurable which corresponds to the universal physical principles expressed by the productive process.

Once again: the financial accountant takes a directly contrary view. He imagines, falsely, that the representation of the functional relationship between cost and gain in output can be represented by straight-line, connect-the-dots sort of mathematics, just as John von Neumann and Oskar Morgenstern did in their notorious, and essentially incompetent, *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*.¹⁰

While such cause-effect-relations are present in all successfully *anti-entropic* acts of production, the strict proof of the point which I have just summarized lies within the domain of so-called "macro-economics," the study of the function of local (so-called "micro-economic") activity within the physical economic process as a whole. By "physical" we mean measurements made in non-monetary, non-financial terms; or, in other words, we mean that all financial statistics must be interpreted as a mere reflection of the effects of purely physical-economic activity.

This means, that we must include, as biogeochemist Vladimir Vernadsky insisted, the notion of physical economy from the standpoint of what he termed a *noösphere*. That is,

9. For example, in my "California Takes a Swift Look at Today's Economists," *EIR*, Feb. 2, 2001.

10. John von Neuman and Oskar Morgenstern, *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*, 3rd ed. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953).

human cognition acting upon the principle of life, as expressed by the biosphere, which, in turn, is transforming the non-living domain upon which, and within which it acts. The essential form of “macroeconomic” human action upon the biosphere, is the application of the discovery of experimentally validatable universal physical principles.

From the standpoint of mathematical physics, as successively defined by Carl Gauss, Lejeune Dirichlet, and Bernhard Riemann, the aggregation of presently discovered universal physical principles has the geometric form of what is called a manifold. This notion of a manifold supersedes absolutely the so-called Euclidean geometry used by Galileo, Descartes, Newton, et al. In other words, it is the addition of new discoveries of universal physical principles, by means of which mankind is enabled to increase its power, per capita and per square kilometer, in and over the macroeconomic domain, the universe, in which mankind exists.

It is, thus, to the degree that we develop our young in the ability to cooperate in the discovery and use of such a progressively unfolding manifold of universal physical principles, that we obtain the anti-entropic effects properly associated with the notion of a society’s macro-economic *physical* “profit.”

Once this physical aspect of the matter is taken into account, we are obliged to turn our attention to the social aspects of this physical process. The history of cultures, especially the historically unprecedented rates of success of post-Fourteenth-Century, globally extended modern European civilization, shows us that what we may also recognize as certain universal *cultural* principles, governing the relationship of people in society, determine the relative degree of likelihood that a society will employ and foster the discovery of universal physical principles for the purpose of increase of the relative anti-entropy of the relationship between the human species and its noösphere.

This attention to universal cultural principles, and their functional relationship to the discovery and use of universal physical principles, enables us to define functional distinctions between relatively healthy and pathological forms of cultural manifold (e.g., matrices), with an effective degree of relative rigor. This ought to be the standpoint for education in, and practice of statecraft. From this vantage-point, we must say that *the oligarchical model, as typified by the British monarchy’s case, belongs to the same class of pathological cultural types as the fallen pagan empires of known past history, such as those of ancient Babylon and Rome.* On this account, the system represented by that monarchy is doomed to *precisely the relative degree it tends to converge upon becoming globally hegemonic!*

Nothing expresses that propensity for self-doom more neatly, in physical-economic terms, than the combination of oligarchical cultural values associated with the combination of “shareholder value” with globalized notions of “free trade.” Call it the “Ozymandias Syndrome.”

That means, that if a culture imposes behavior upon its society which results in a systemically entropic unfolding of the physical-economic relations between the entire population and nature, that society, if it continues that habit, is ultimately doomed to collapse. The legendary fallen empires of history, fit that pattern.

For this purpose, we may assort societies into two general types. The two types are assorted empirically, by examining the evolution of the demographic characteristics of entire societies, in their approximately “closed system” relationship to the region of the noösphere which that population inhabits and exploits. Societies in which the localized noösphere is developing anti-entropically, typify one of the two types; societies which may prosper at home, by looting populations and regions abroad, constitute an opposing type.

In the case of ancient Mesopotamia and Rome, for example, these cultures ascended to increased power for a time through parasitical looting of other populations and territories. Once the limits of expanded looting of that form were reached, that culture went into an internal decline, as the cyclical patterns in ancient Mesopotamia, the successive, respective demographic collapses of ancient Rome and Byzantium attest.

Thus, as in the case of the rise of the British Empire, and its extension in the form of assimilating the U.S.A. into a global Anglo-American system, the degree to which the empire expanded, increased its rate of proximity to its inevitable doom. The past approximately dozen years, since the beginning of the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact alliance, until the present, typifies that historical pattern from the past. The typically pagan-imperialist types of measures taken, to gobble up the parts of the world which had been outside the Anglo-American domain, as long as Soviet power continued, set into motion an acceleration of the process leading to the presently immediate doom of that form of Anglo-American system itself.

Typical of the same process of self-inflicted doom, is the effect of post-1971 changes in U.S. policy toward the region of Central and South America. The WWF’s present, NAFTA-related threat to Brazil’s existence, typifies the ongoing pattern seen in the cases of Argentina and Mexico, in 1982, in narco-terrorism-ridden Colombia, in Panama, Ecuador, Peru, Venezuela, and so on.

Under Franklin Roosevelt, and also Kennedy, the United States’ policy toward the states of Central and South America tended toward the intentions expressed earlier by John Quincy Adams and Abraham Lincoln. This rich and vastly untapped portion of the continent, with a population already infused with the crucial elements of modern European culture, represented one of the richest potentials for economic growth and power in the world at large. To the degree, the U.S. promoted the self-development of the sovereign republics of the hemisphere in ways consistent with what Hamilton and others had defined as “the American System of political-economy,” the

Americas, with a combined population of much less than a billion persons, with such vastly untapped natural resources, was the most crucial strategic self-interest of the U.S.A. itself. To the degree we aided these neighbors in enriching the average standard of living and employment of all, we could not fail to prosper mightily, and indefinitely, from cooperation.

Beginning 1971, especially since 1982, we of the U.S.A. threw all those riches away! We were the fool who cooked and ate the goose who laid the golden egg! Obviously, we have not enjoyed a truly sane government of the U.S.A. since President Lyndon Johnson, and even he had the problems of suffering that queasy feeling of being the successor to assassinated President Kennedy. We have wrecked and looted the entirety of that great region of our hemisphere's continent.

The same was done, under the direction of Thatcher, Mitterrand, and Bush, to eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. We destroyed the built-up productive forces of that vast region of Eurasia, all for the sake of those lunatic qualities of imperial, geopolitical motives, of destroying, and looting potential economic competitors, which we associate with Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski's circles. Thus, destroying the outskirts of "Anglo-American imperial power," in so much of Eurasia, Africa, and Central and South America, we drew the noose around our own nations' political-economic neck, just as had the rulers of the pagan, slavery-ridden city of Rome.

That said, focus upon the state of mind which sets the oligarchical mentality of the British monarchy, and its lacks, apart from the kind of society which had built up all of the great achievements of the pre-1965 U.S.A. and rebuilt post-war, 1945-65 western Europe.

Now, to sum up the working point. The distinction between the human individual and all lower species, lies essentially in the specifically human quality of cognition, as opposed to, distinct from reductionist deductive constructs. It is through that mode of cognition which is formally associated, in mathematical physics, with what Leibniz named *Analysis Situs*, or *geometry of position*, that the individual human mind is able to define those true paradoxes which, in turn, prompt that mind to discover an hypothetical new universal physical principle. If that hypothetical principle is validated by experimental methods, it, and the technologies derived from it, may be applied to human practice. This is the primary source of the anti-entropy exhibited by durably profitable forms of national economy.

Thus, the essential thing in economics, is to define the circumstances needed to foster that kind of anti-entropic process in the physical economy of the nation as a whole.

Two conditions must be satisfied to permit that benefit to be realized. First, we must develop the total environment in an appropriate way. The best way to think about that, is to adopt Vernadsky's view of the noosphere. That means to foster the biospherical processes, as such, which spread and improve the potential for support of human life and its technolog-

ical practice at rising levels of per-capita performance by the society as a whole. Second, we must develop the individuals, and provide them the means of production and increasing capital-intensive, and increasingly energy-intensive, systems of cooperation on which the fostering of science-driven technological and cultural progress depends.

On the second account, we must focus upon the development of the newborn individual to maturity a score or more years later. This means, systems of education of the young which raise the potential of the individual to a high degree of cognitive maturity *and motivation*. This signifies, for example, that any sane nation will insist that during the first two decades of the life of any new individual person, the years of primary and secondary education and popular culture will be governed by what is known as strictly Classical-humanist modes of development of the moral potential of each individual, through emphasis on cognitive experience of discovery and rediscovery of universal principles, rather than mere learning.

This means that we must provide the conditions of family, community, and national life, in which the noetic qualities of increased productive power of labor are fostered to the relatively highest degree possible.

From what we should have adduced from both our knowledge of pre-history as well as history, it should be apparent to us that humanity of the past has made vast contributions to knowledge, that over hundreds of thousands, even millions of years to date, from which we benefit today. Yet, most of those cultures from which we so benefit today, were failures, as cultures, in their time. Indeed, all cultures, prior to the Fifteenth-Century Renaissance, even including the stunningly best of Classical Greek, were failures in the end. This paradox should grab our concentrated attention, should we wish to avert the doom which presently menaces the U.S.A. and its entire population under its new President.

To sum up the point to be made on this account, the individual person is naturally great in potential. The issue is, under what political-social conditions does that individual live, and what part of the whole society is encouraged, or even permitted to develop in ways consistent with human nature? If we look at the galloping depravity which is to be seen in the condition of the United Kingdom's economy, and the Yahoo-like cultural condition into which its general population has been plunged, over the course of the time since the Profumo scandal, we have relevant evidence to consider. We have similar evidence in the case of the U.S.A. over the recent thirty-five years, in continental western Europe during the same period, and throughout Central and South America.

The problem is the retreat from the conception of the human individual as universally a cognitive creature, thus, contrary to Hobbes and Locke, made in the image of the Creator of the universe, a creature which society must develop to its corresponding individual potential, and must foster for that individual the opportunity to make the contribution to

progress of which he, or she, by nature is properly destined to contribute.

Thus, the British monarchy, with its expressed views on the nature of man and beast, has been a leading political and cultural force for evil on this planet. The catastrophe which looms immediately before us marks the end of an empire, an empire defined by the kind of Anglo-American domination which the British monarchy's role and influence represents today. We have reached the point, at which another stroke of folly, or two, brings the whole shebang to a certain culmination.

Either we rid ourselves of that legacy typified by the morbid ideology of the WWF, or the whole shebang soon collapses. Such a moment is sometimes called "The Twilight of the Gods."

Once again, the essence of the study of history is the study of history in its making. The essence of that profession, is the development of one's capability to recognize the echoes of centuries-long processes of cultural evolution and devolution, as reflected in what may be distinguished as clinical crucial symptoms in the relatively short-term and small. Such is the importance of the incidents identified as recently occurring in Australia and Brazil.

Appendix

WWF's October 2000 Brief

The complaint filed by WWF-Brazil features a string of a dozen or so alleged statements of relevant fact. Taken in their entirety, as a single statement, that list of so-called facts is polluted, pervasively, by a willfully reckless disregard for truth. Since it is not the purpose of this report to supersede the functions of Brazil's legal system, but only to show the political and moral character of WWF's actions, a few examples are sufficient for that purpose here. I list relevant portions of WWF's claims as to fact, together with identification of some of the published materials showing that WWF claims as to fact are either demonstrably willfully declared falsehoods, or have been uttered in willfully reckless disregard for facts readily accessible to an association possessing the world-wide and high-level resources of WWF and associated organizations.

Notably, in its own brief, WWF-Brazil reports that "the WWF network . . . has a structure similar to the United Nations Organization." It describes the WWF as composed of 27 national organizations, among them WWF Brazil, as active in 96 countries, and as having 4.7 millions affiliates. Given the positions of its leading officials and supporting organizations, an association with such immense resources must be held to a higher standard of truthful regard for available fact

than even many governments of the world, and certainly much higher than a more typical public figure. On this account, WWF's moral and legal responsibility to proceed with reasonable regard for truthfulness must meet a much higher standard of threshold than even that to which many among the world's governments today must be held.

In reading the Plaintiff's brief dated Oct. 16, 2000, we recognize thirteen distinguishable claims made by the Plaintiff in the course of that document. As noted below, two of these might be consolidated with other claims which would reduce the thirteen to which we respond here to eleven. Where clarity requires this, I have indicated the relevant portion of that Plaintiff's brief in a footnote.

WWF's *Claimed Fact #1* appears in their brief as follows:

"The . . . [defendants] accuse the Plaintiff of participating in a 'well-articulated offensive against the highest levels of the oligarchic Anglo-American Establishment, whose direct objective is nothing less than hindering the development of the South American hinterland . . . , strangling the entire region through lack of low-cost transportation routes, and with little possibility of overcoming its condition of a mere raw materials producer.' "

Here, the WWF has perpetrated two willfully misleading reconstructions of what is otherwise an accurate, isolated excerpt from a widely circulated pamphlet, whose title, in English translation, is, *The Green Mafia Assaults the Waterways*, but the referenced text does not say that the WWF "participates in;" in reality, the sentence immediately following that cited by the WWF complaint reads: "That offensive, coordinated by the apparatus of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) which gravitates around the World Wide Fund for Nature, and other entities directly linked to the House of Windsor." In honest citation, the citer does not alter the content of one sentence in a paragraph to the purpose of conveying a different meaning than is clearly shown if the cited sentence is examined in the light of relevant features of an immediately adjoining one.

The *EIR* edition of Oct. 28, 1994, featured an in-depth report entitled, "The Coming Fall of the House of Windsor." This report featured two articles by Lyndon LaRouche, and supplied detailed documentation of WWF global operations. This featured a flow chart (p. 24) tracing key WWF board personnel and their positions on boards of directors of Barclays Bank PLC, Shell Transport & Trading Co. PLC, The Bank of England, RTZ Corporation PLC (with Queen Elizabeth II as the largest individual shareholder), N.M. Rothschild & Sons, Ltd., National Westminster Bank PLC, The Telegraph PLC, Imperial Chemical Industries PLC, Anglo-American Corp. of South Africa Ltd., De Beers Consolidated Mines Ltd., and De Beers Centenary AG.

This report included further notable elements, which bear upon the willful disregard for truth which is shown by WWF's *Claimed Fact #2*, which claims that they were slandered by the Defendants when they said that ". . . 'The WWF was in-

strumental in insuring that companies of the Commonwealth, a euphemism for the British Empire, predominated in their control over Africa's raw materials, as well as over a large part of the vast network of parks and natural reserves which have carved up a majority of the countries of the continent. At the same time, they have prevented the nations' exploration of their own natural resources, for mining and other purposes, these companies blocked or made impossible, the building of large-scale infrastructure, essential to regional socio-economic development.' "

Thos further elements include: a partial membership list of the *1001 Club* and short biographical profiles, drawn from composite membership lists; and an article by Al Douglas, "The WWF: Race Science and World Government," with a detailed pre-history of the WWF with the Society for the Preservation of the Wildlife Fauna of the Empire (now the Fauna and Flora Preservation Society, FFPS) and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), detailing the role of Sir Peter Scott, Julian Huxley, and British Foreign Office permanent secretary Max Nicholson, whose 1970 history of the launching of world environmentalist movement, *The Environmental Revolution: A Guide for the New Masters of the World*, stated, in part: "the lesson has been learnt and reservedly accepted that Ducks Unlimited means Sovereignty Superseded."

The same *EIR* of Oct. 28, 1994, details protected areas and parks in Africa, with data drawn from International Union for the Conservation of Nature "Protected Areas of the World," 1989 and 1991 editions. It also details the overlay of WWF directors with leading British Commonwealth raw material and banking cartels.

See also *EIR Special Report*, "The True Story Behind The Fall of the House of Windsor," September 1997; *EIR*, May 24, 1996, "The Sun Never Sets on the New British Empire," including "Raw Materials Cartels Lock Up World Economy," by Richard Freeman, pp. 103-112, and "The Anglo-Dutch Corporate Empire," by Anthony K. Wikrent.

The foregoing, widely circulated published materials, show the WWF's complaint to have been crafted with flagrant disregard for truth.

Plaintiff's *Claimed Fact #3*¹, is a plain hoax. "Conspire" is a word inserted by the WWF, not the defendant; nowhere does WWF show that, in that referenced document, the MSIA accuses the Plaintiff of "conspiring" to such an effect.

Plaintiff's *Claimed Fact #4*², is addressed, below, under

1. "Likewise, the document under discussion accuses Plaintiff of conspiring against Brazil's development, acting with the stated purpose of rendering the Brazilian State economically and technologically inferior to other nations. It is therefore irrefutable that said document causes effective damage to Plaintiff, since it directly harms Plaintiff's image and good name, therefore requiring its immediate confiscation."

2. ". . . The Defendants accuse the WWF Network (of which the Plaintiff is a part) of conspiring to impede the full development of underdeveloped countries. . . ."

facts pertaining to Plaintiff's *Claimed Fact #13*.

WWF's *Claimed Fact #5*³, willfully paraphrases a passage from the MSIA, by inserting the term "front," as if it were employed so by the MSIA, which never, in fact, occurred.

Fact 5 is also addressed, below, together with Fact 13.

WWF's *Claimed Fact #6*, is simply irrelevant, since MSIA nowhere asserts "the thesis" that the WWFs are "merely the puppets of the House of Windsor."

Within *Claimed Fact #7*, the WWF states falsely that: "Mr. Nilder Costa, the third defendant, gave a speech in the [Brazilian] city of Campo Grande, on Feb. 25, 2000. In said speech, the Defendant attacked the Plaintiff and the WWF in many ways, giving out entirely false pieces of information, such as, for example, that members of the movement, including the WWF President, had been members of the Nazi Party."

This is typical of the resort to outright lying, as well as slovenliness by the Plaintiff's October brief. What was presented at that Campo Grande meeting was mention of the former Nazi party membership of a single personality, the Netherlands' Prince Bernhard, the leader of the "1001 Club," and President of the association behind the WWF. It was at later public events, that Mr. Nilder Costa presented a photocopy of the Nazi party membership card of Prince Bernhard.

During the 1990s, a series of documents were declassified in the Netherlands and in the U.S. National Archives, which provide the "paper trail" to prove what has long been known: that Prince Bernhard was a member of Hitler's NSDAP (the National Socialist Workers Party — or, for short, the "Nazis"). These documents include:

(a) A record of Bernhard's dues payments to the NSDAP, which show that Prince Bernhard ("Prinz zur Lippe, Bernhard Leopold"), born June 29, 1911, joined the Nazi Party's Greater Berlin organization on May 1, 1933 (upper righthand corner, "Eintritt"). His membership number is 2583009 (in the upper far right). He only quit the Nazis because he wanted to marry Princess Juliana of the Netherlands, and the Dutch royal house was anxious to avoid any possibility of scandal;

(b) A letter prepared by the U.S. Embassy in The Hague, to the U.S. Secretary of State, confirming Prince Bernhard's membership in the NSDAP, from a list prepared by Headquarters Berlin Command, Office of Military Government for Germany (US) on Nov. 1, 1947;

(c) A list of NSDAP members, which includes not only Bernhard, but other members of his oligarchic family (those listed as "Prinz z. Lippe," or "Prinzess z. Lippe");

(d) An Aug. 10, 1948 letter on U.S. Department of State letterhead, to "The Officer in Charge of the American Mission, The Hague," "concerning the removal of the name of

3. "The Defendant states that the Plaintiff represents the interests of the House of Windsor, which, in turn, controls various large multinational companies. The WWF network, therefore, would serve only as a 'front' for defending the interests of these companies and their controllers. . . ."

Prinz v. Lippe, Prinz Leonor
 2572009
 Eintritt: 1.5.33

Wohnung: Repitkenm. 39139

Beruf: *Wid.* geb. am: 29.6.11 in: *MIA*

Überwiesen am: von: Überwiesen am: *27.8.33 nach: Wilhelmsh.*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1934	-10	-10	-10	-10	-10							
1935	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1							

Dr. Hans-Saxel: Org. Stat. Nr. 84. 60000.

Vorname	Geb.Dat.	Mitgl.Nr.	Eintr.	Bemerkung
Georg v. Hessen	8.11.06	3766312	1.5.37	vorstorben lt. Hess. Mass. 11.37/1
Cecilia v. Hessen	22.6.11	3766313	1.5.37	vorstorben lt. Hess. Mass. 11.37/1
Alexis v. Hessen	8.6.11	384026	1.5.32	
Christoph v. Hessen	14.5.01	385176	1.11.31	
Philipp v. Hessen	6.11.96	418991	1.10.30	Ehrenreich
Richard v. Hessen	14.5.01	1205562	1.9.32	
Wilhelm v. Hessen	1.3.05	4187621	1.5.32	verfallen lt. Kurhess. 5.42.19
Wolfgang v. Hessen	2.11.96	1794914	1.4.32	
Marianne v. Hessen	23.8.13	462881	1.5.37	
Wilhelm v. Hessen	26.10.14	3515493	1.5.33	
Viktoria v. Hessen	20.11.00	3900506	1.5.37	
Cecilia v. Hessen	20.11.00	3900507	1.5.37	
Friedrich v. Hessen	1.5.68	4814689	1.5.38	verstorben lt. Brit. Nr. 1575/40
Karl v. Hessen	22.4.72	4814690	1.5.38	
Margarete v. Hessen	22.4.72	4814690	1.5.38	
Ernst v. Lippe	12.6.02	88835	1.5.28	Ehrenreicher
Bernhard v. Lippe	29.6.11	2503009	1.5.33	ausgetreten lt. Brit. Nr. 870/37
Ferdinand v. Lippe	16.7.03	4533031	1.5.37	verstorben lt. Sachsen 3.40/2
Klodwig v. Lippe	27.9.09	479952	1.11.30	

NSDAP members Residing in the Netherlands

The Honorable
 The Secretary of State,
 Washington, D. C.

Sir:

I have the honor to refer to the consolidated list of NSDAP members residing in the Netherlands, which was forwarded to the Embassy by the Department accompanied by transmittal slip dated May 27, 1948, signed by the Chief of Foreign Activity Correlation. The list was apparently prepared by Headquarters Berlin Command, Office of Military Government for Germany (US), 7771st Document Center, Machine Tabulations Branch, APO 742A. The list is dated November 1, 1947, bears the notation "Order No. 4120/01" and is in eight parts.

In Part 5 of the list, containing names beginning the letters L - N, the following entry appears:

Lippe-Blesterfeld, Bernhard
 Occupation: Prince
 Birth place: Jena
 Membership No. 02583029
 Symbol "3" (in the NSDAP correspondence)
 Date entered Netherlands: May 1, 1933
 Date of birth: June 29, 1911

The person referred to, known in the Netherlands as Prince Bernhard, is the husband of Royal Princess Juliana who is to accede to the throne of the Netherlands in September next.

The subject's/
 Embassy

SECRET

DECLASSIFIED PER EXECUTIVE ORDER 12356, SECTION 3.3, NND PROJECT NUMBER 765023, BY 76/DA8, DATE 11/23/93

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
 WASHINGTON

August 10, 1948

AIR MAIL

SECRET

No. 114

To the
 Officer in Charge of the American Mission,
 The Hague.

The Secretary of State refers to the Embassy's despatch No. 353 of June 23, 1948, concerning the removal of the name of Prince Bernhard from the consolidated list of NSDAP members residing in the Netherlands.

Since Prince Bernhard's name is also included in the consolidated World List, which has been widely distributed throughout the Government as well as outside the United States, it is felt that at this time it is not practicable to alter the current lists by deleting his name. Should there be any occasion in the future to issue a new edition of these lists, consideration can then be given to the request for the deletion of Prince Bernhard's name.

Documents declassified in the Netherlands and the United States prove that Prince Bernhard was a member of the Nazi party.

Prince Bernhard from the consolidated list of NSDAP members residing in the Netherlands." The relevant State Department official notes that, "Since Prince Bernhard's name is also included in the consolidated World List, which has been widely distributed through the Government as well as outside the United States, it is felt that at this time it is not practicable to alter the current lists by deleting his name."

Nazi Party connections, such as *Queen Juliana*, by William Hoffman (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1979), pp. 67-69.

Skipping over the silly *Claimed Fact* #8⁴, the extensive, relevant publications by *EIR* et al., show that the WWF's

4. The WWF brief complains that the MSIA circulated a pamphlet "with the following title: 'The WWF's Forest Trap'. It is worth noting that 'trap,' according to the Aurelio Dictionary, means 'plot or intrigue.' Thus, the very

*Claimed Fact #9*⁵ proceeded purely and simply from willfully reckless disregard for truth.

See *EIR*, Oct. 28, 1994, “Prince Philip’s Murderous World View, In His Own Words,” and *EIR*, Dec. 16, 1994, “Prince Philip: ‘Doge’ of the Real Fourth Reich,” by Scott Thompson and Jeffrey Steinberg, and also “Some of the Better New Books on the Windsors,” providing annotated details on 14 recent books on the current generation of the House of Windsor, many of which were used in preparation of the biographical sketch of Prince Philip which appeared in the same issue of *EIR*.

On the WWF’s *Claimed Facts #10* and *#11*, its brief makes no effort to identify factual support for its claim. Notably, on Fact 10, it merely cites a passage from MSIA publications which is truthful, and not contradicted by the Plaintiff.⁶ See September 1997 *EIR Special Report*, “The Invisible Empire of NGOs,” by Joseph Brewda, documenting specific leading NGOs which are headed by members of the House of Lords/Privy Council, with specific biographies of Viscount Cranborne, Lord Avebury, and Baroness Carolyn Cox of Queensbury.

So-called *Claimed Fact #11*⁷, is no better than irrelevant sarcasm.

WWF’s *Claimed Fact #12*⁸ is shown to be willfull falsification, by a visit to the WWF’s own website, which repeatedly identifies Prince Philip as International President Emeritus of the WWF—just as the MSIA does in its publications.

title of the text already demonstrates its intent to defame by denoting the Plaintiff as responsible for some secret scheme.”

5. “In fact, diverse ‘information’ of the most absurd, mistaken and baseless sort were spread maliciously and without the least concern with the possible, and even foreseeable, damage that they could bring to the image of the Plaintiff, before Brazilian civil society. . . . It is stated in the material that the WWF International is a movement led by the British Monarchy and financed by the families of the Anglo-American oligarchical Establishment, with the objective of keeping Brazil as an ‘underdeveloped’ country—which is absolutely insane!!!”

6. “The “secret agenda” of the NGOs led by the WWF objectively seeks to keep Brazil encircled and sterilize any pro-development impulse in the country. . . . Environmentalism is a new disguise for the old ideas of malthusian colonialism, not employing, as in the past, military invasions, but invasions by an irregular army of NGOs financed by the Anglo-American oligarchical Establishment families, under the leadership of the British Monarchy, the House of Windsor. The power of these groups can be appreciated by their effective control over: the Bank of England; the U.S. Federal Reserve System; the large banks, investment houses and insurance companies of Europe and the U.S.; . . .”

7. The WWF states that the MSIA has a “prophetic style, characteristic of someone who is announcing great truths, unknown to common mortals. . . . The mentioned text spreads, in an extremely efficient and convincing way diverse assertions that do not have the least basis in fact, nor could it be otherwise, since they constitute a true exercise in creative speculation.”

8. “A clear indication of the degree of disinformation of the Defendants is in the repeated statement that Prince Philip is president of the WWF International, when his term ended several years ago [!]. . . . Apparently they [the Defendants] do not feel constrained from carrying out a truly defamatory spectacle, designed to trick unsuspecting readers and spectators.”

In the WWF’s *Claimed Fact #13*, WWF summarily reviews seven items, which they characterize as “factual errors and distortions.” In fact, all that *EIR* and MSIA have stated on these matters is not only true, but extensively documented in a most carefully crafted and responsible way. In these items, the WWF relies chiefly on its willfully false representation of the facts.

Compare, for example, *EIR*, Jan. 13, 1995, “The ‘Green’ Terrorists on Prince Philip’s Leash.” This begins with a juxtaposition of quotes from Prince Philip: “In the event that I am reincarnated, I would like to return as a deadly virus, in order to contribute something to solve overpopulation,” (August 1988, to Deutsche Presse Agentur) and Earth First! founder David Foreman: “AIDS is not a malediction, but the welcome and natural remedy to reduce the population on the planet. . . . Should human beings disappear, I surely wouldn’t mind. . . . Just as the Black Plague ended the feudal era, so AIDS will end the industrial era of progress. That is a good thing, since industrial progress brings population growth,” Nov. 8, 1987 issue of *Earth First! Journal*).

On one element of WWF’s *Claimed Fact #13*⁹, as also its *Claimed Fact #5*, see: *EIR*, Jan. 13, 1995, “British Oligarchs Created the Eco-Terrorist Movement,” by Jeffrey Steinberg and Rogelio A. Maduro. This detailed the founding of Friends of the Earth, Greenpeace, and Earth First! Members of 1001 Club/WWF, including Peter Cadbury (1001 Club charter member) and Christopher Cadbury (WWF-UK director) put up seed money, via Cadbury Trust, to launch Greenpeace. London Friends of the Earth was headed by Jonathan Porritt, son of the former Governor General of New Zealand, who obtained corporate funding for FOE from Telegraph PLC of Conrad Black’s Hollinger Corporation (Black was a charter member of 1001 Club). “By 1977, the WWF was publicly bankrolling Greenpeace for the purchase and outfitting of a fleet of ships. That year, the Dutch branch of WWF bought the ship *Rainbow Warrior* for Greenpeace, conduiting the money through Greenpeace’s London office. Three years later, Netherlands WWF bought another ship, *Sirius*, and gave it to Greenpeace.” That article also cited Danish TV documentary, “Rainbow Man,” on Greenpeace leader David McTaggart, detailing his links, from 1978, to WWF Executive Director Sir Peter Scott and Prince Philip, including reports of secret meetings at WWF London headquarters including Scott, McTaggart, Dr. Sidney Holt, and Jean Paul Gouin, for the purpose of launching a takeover of the International Whaling Commission. By the late 1980s, McTaggart “retired” from Greenpeace, and the director of Greenpeace London office was Lord Peter Melchett, a former Labour Party Member of Parliament and the heir to the Imperial Chemical Industries PLC fortune.

9. “The Plaintiff did not create nor does it control the association known as Greenpeace, or any other Non-Governmental Organization.”