

## Queen knights head of pro-drug 'Economist'

by Mark Burdman

It is almost impossible to pick up a newspaper anywhere in the world, and read the name Lyndon LaRouche, without the identification, "the man who says the Queen of England pushes drugs." Why the obsessive, cult-like fixation on this point by the media?

For a possible answer, recall the famous "play within the play" scene of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*: It is said there, of a conscience-stricken queen, that "the lady doth protest too much." Buckingham Palace being what it is, there is little chance that its inhabitants will discuss if, and why, their consciences may be stricken, on the issue of drugs or anything else. To get at the matter from a different direction, we ask the question: Why was Evelyn de Rothschild knighted around the turn of this year?

Sir Evelyn has been the chairman of the London *Economist* since 1972. During the period in and around the time of his knighthood, from December 1988 to January 1989, the *Economist* editorial board has waged an open war against the best values of Western civilization. This culminated in a Jan. 21 editorial calling for the *legalization of drugs*.

In ghoulish style, the weekly *Economist* chided those in the U.S. who support a war on drugs. The editorial, titled, "Hooked on just saying no" and subtitled, "Minimizing the evil of drugs means learning to live with them, legally," stated: "Men and (rather fewer) women have since the start of recorded time put enemies in their mouths to steal away their brains. . . . Wise rulers seek to limit the damage, not to ban them." The advice: legalize marijuana and hashish, cocaine, and heroin.

On the first two, it said: "By calling them illegal, the United States wastes millions vainly trying to suppress the trade, and foregoes billions in taxes upon a crop that may now be second in value only to wheat." A "sensible policy" for cocaine, it went on, "would tax it more stiffly, and restrict its sales outlets more tightly than its main competitors, just as spirits are controlled and taxed more than beer." As for heroin: "Heroin's victims need doctors, but the law puts them in the hands of gangsters; by calling them criminals it deters

them from seeking treatment, so spreads the evil it was meant to contain."

It concluded with advice to new U.S. anti-drug czar William Bennett: "Prohibition cruelly compounds the problems it was meant to solve. So end it. Legalize, control, discourage. . . ."

If the Queen objects to this, will she revoke Sir Evelyn's new title? After all, in the case of the spy Anthony Blunt, his designation as *Sir* Anthony Blunt was revoked, once his treason had been publicly revealed in the late 1970s (although the real story of his missions on behalf of the British monarchy has, to this day, not become known).

For patriots, the *Economist's* advocacy of drug legalization should also be seen as treason, and as a matter of vital national security. After all, the same edition of the *Economist* that called for drug legalization, ran a news feature on the drug plague hitting the U.K., reporting that in Britain, the "drug problem stems not from one drug—and certainly not from crack—but from many. All the available figures suggest that drug use is spreading. Amphetamines, cannabis, cocaine, heroin (also cheap in Britain), LSD, and tranquilizers are all more popular than ever, consumed in market towns as well as inner cities. The main increases in drug use so far have come in two waves: the first in the late 1960s and early 1970s, the second in the early 1980s. Consumption in the mid-1970s and mid-1980s seems to have been relatively stable. The latest seizure figures suggest that Britain is on the verge of a third surge. As customs barriers come down in 1992, such a surge may last well into the next decade."

"Customs barriers coming down" refers, of course, to the "Europe 1992" reforms for the corporatist restructuring of Western Europe. True to its drug-legalizer profile, the *Economist* is one of the more enthusiastic backers of "Europe 1992." The problem is, so is Buckingham Palace. Is the Palace aware of the drugs-surge danger referred to in the *Economist* article? If so, why does it support "Europe 1992"?

### Up with Dark Ages, down with LaRouche

The case of the *Economist* and the knighting of its chairman, is all the more egregious, since in two recent editions prior to the drug-legalizer issue, the magazine had run editorials that qualify as crimes against humanity:

- In its Dec. 24 edition, it welcomed the potential extinction of the human race, under the heading, "On the destiny of species," subtitled, "In the long run we are all extinct. But humanity could go out in style."

- In its Jan. 14 edition, the magazine called for the "rehabilitation" of the "maligned Dark Ages," and attacked the Renaissance for having given the Dark Ages a bad name. It also called for the rehabilitation of Neville Chamberlain, fretting that he "gave appeasement a bad name" (but implicitly supporting appeasement as such); former British Prime Minister Edward Heath, for having brought about British entrance into the European Community (the stepping-stone

to "Europe 1992"); and Aaron Burr, who killed Alexander Hamilton in a duel. "Surely Alexander Hamilton deserved at least a punch on the nose?" the magazine commented.

The signals here should not be missed. In mid-January, the *Economist* refused to carry a paid political advertisement submitted by the Schiller Institute attacking the Alexandria, Virginia frameup of Lyndon LaRouche and associates. The magazine said the ad was too "anti-Soviet."

In relevant quarters of the British Establishment, LaRouche is despised precisely for opposing today's revival of the Chamberlain appeasement policies and for his opposition to "Europe 1992." More than that, LaRouche is widely known in the City of London and elsewhere, as the most impassioned proponent of "Hamiltonian economics" alive today. In an article in its "American Survey" section on the LaRouche conviction in Alexandria, the magazine had nervously noted the growing electoral support in the U.S. for LaRouche supporters, and reported: "His campaign against international bankers has won some support in the depressed Midwest."

### The clan of Lord Vic Rothschild

The *Economist* speaks for some of the most important elements of the British banking and intelligence establishment. It is owned by the Pearson Group and the Lazard banking interests. The former is the financial repository of the trust funds of the Pearson family, whose chief representative is Lord Cowdray. The Cowdray-Pearson clan has been, historically, the chief interest in the powerful British Petroleum conglomerate. London's Lazard bank is linked to Lazard Frères in the U.S. (Felix Rohatyn, Katharine Graham of the *Washington Post*, etc.) and in France, and is a key "Europe 1992" bank.

Sir Evelyn de Rothschild is the chairman of the N.M. Rothschild's investment bank, which has taken a leading role in the "privatization" gambit of the past years. A director of this bank is Sir Evelyn's uncle, Lord Victor Rothschild, one of the more significant figures in the British Establishment over the past six decades. According to one senior British insider, Lord Rothschild spends most of his time these days working out of the bank.

In the 1930s, Victor Rothschild was a member of the select secretive Cambridge Apostles cult. He was an intimate of the Burgess-Blunt-Philby-Maclean Soviet spy nest. During the 1980s, he has deployed considerable energy to disprove that he was the "Fifth Man" in this nest. Some expert observers wonder if Victor Rothschild is, in fact, the "First Man," the controller and/or patron of the nest.

Victor Rothschild embodies the intersection point of the East-West "Trust"; the "Andropov-Ogarkov Kindergarten" which today runs the U.S.S.R.; the leading levels of Anglo-American banking; and high-level circles of British scientific intelligence. His sister, Miriam, is a top scientific adviser to Prince Charles, whose penchant for pseudo-scientific quackery is well known. Charles's gnostic and leftist proclivities

## Extinction of the species

*Brief excerpts from the London Economist's Dec. 24, 1988, editorial entitled, "On the destiny of species":*

Extinction is an inescapable fact of life, and this is no bad thing. Conflict is necessary to an ecology, rather as competition is necessary to a market. So long as there is conflict, there will be natural selection. So long as there is natural selection, new species will evolve—and established ones will die off. Extinction is an integral part of the history of life: No species is going to last for ever.

There is no reason to think that the infant species *Homo sapiens* is any exception to this rule. . . . Admittedly, *Homo sapiens* has more control over its environment than its predecessors had. . . .

Controlling the environment to any great degree, though, is a new-found skill. There is not much to suggest that organized agriculture, the most successful way to pervert the course of nature, stretches back further than 10,000 years—a tenth or so of the time since *Homo sapiens* emerged as a species.

This is not to say that the rise of human civilization is insignificant. But there is no way of showing that it will be much help to the world in the long run. It is still too early to tell. . . .

were in significant part cultivated by his great-uncle, the late Lord Mountbatten. Mountbatten personally brought Soviet agent Armand Hammer into Buckingham Palace, where he is well entrenched to the present day, as one of Charles's best friends.

The Mountbatten-Rothschild connection comes in from a second direction. Mountbatten was a patron of the "peace movement," and sponsored the activities of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI). The chief British representative on the Governing Board of SIPRI today, Emma Rothschild, is Victor's daughter, an important operative in the KGB-linked international "peace research" movement. Her father is reportedly exerting considerable energy to prevent further discussion of her mysterious role in the circumstances leading to the assassination of Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme in 1986; during late 1986-early 1987, this was a hot subject of international controversy. In March of this year, a book is being released in Britain on the Palme assassination by an anonymous author, entitled, *Death of a Statesman*. A high-level British source reports that the actual author is none other than Emma Rothschild herself.