

British royal racists are on a global rampage

by Nancy Spannaus

“Britain’s Decline Is Over—Official,” stated a March 29 headline of the British news service Reuters, in reporting the wrap-up speech of Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd at the Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA) conference on “Britain in the World.” Hurd said that Britain should reject advice to pull back from a global role, “for the effort which Britain now makes in the world is an effort which Britain can and should sustain and increase.”

The reality is that Britain’s global role, a continuation of the evil geopolitical manipulation previously carried out by the Venetian oligarchy, *is* under challenge. That challenge is represented primarily by the potential represented in the government of the United States under President William Clinton, who, having declared an end to the “special relationship” with Great Britain, is seeking to reestablish a foreign policy based on American national interest. Although the President is still evading the central issue of the systemic international financial collapse, he is pursuing policies in the Balkans, the Middle East, Asia, and North Africa, as well as relations with the superpowers Russia and China, which threaten to bring British leverage to an end. Before the total financial breakdown forces the President’s hand, the House of Windsor is cutting a swath of irregular warfare and terrorism intended to sabotage any hope of stability.

As usual, the British viewpoint is expressed accurately by the monarchy’s U.S. agent of influence, former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. Speaking at the same RIIA affair as Hurd, Kissinger reiterated his longstanding attack on traditional American foreign policy, and insisted that the “equilibrium, or balance of power” approach, which is rejected in America, be adopted. Kissinger honed in on the Asian theater in particular, arguing that “we can talk—as we do talk periodically—about a Pacific community, but anybody studying the relations of Japan, China, Korea, the Asia part of Russia, even India, to each other, must come to the view that, at this stage, their relations to each other are more similar to the relations of nineteenth-century European states to each other than of twentieth-



Iraqi victims of the Thatcher-Bush Gulf war, 1991. The British oligarchy is fostering irregular warfare, terrorism, and ethnic and religious conflicts all around the world, in a new version of the Thirty Years' War.

century European states.”

Kissinger's remarks, of course, do not reflect a statement of objective fact. They are a declaration of intent by his masters in Great Britain to ensure that stability does not ensue in the Pacific theater, or anywhere else for that matter. To that end, British assets in the separatist and terrorist underground internationally, are now being deployed to carry out irregular warfare that will either create conflicts, or prevent conflicts from being resolved through common projects of economic development, as in the Middle East.

The historical backdrop

“There's really a war going on, a war and a half, between the British monarchy and the government of the United States today,” remarked U.S. statesman Lyndon LaRouche in his weekly radio interview with “*EIR Talks*” on April 5. The background to this war goes back to before the founding of the United States of America, to the period of 1688, when the British Crown attempted to shut down the great experiment in republicanism in Massachusetts. And without understanding the basis for this fundamental conflict between the British monarchy and the institutional foundations of the United States, there is no way to understand what underlies the apparently independent eruption of out-of-control terrorism in area after area of the African and Asian continents, not to mention sections of Ibero-America and Europe.

The British monarchy, acting with the methods it inherited from the Venetians, is the *primus inter pares* among the

world oligarchy, as *EIR* elaborated in its groundbreaking work on the “Coming Fall of the House of Windsor” (Oct. 28, 1994). As such, the British rulers consider it a matter of *species-survival* to eliminate threats to their power to control world events. They would rather see nation after nation be destroyed—and even permit the economic and cultural destruction of their own nesting ground—than to permit the flourishing of prosperous republics, and alliances among them.

On this basis, the United States has always been the major perceived enemy of the British monarchy. Not only did the United States defeat the British in *three wars*—the War of Independence, the War of 1812, and the Civil War—but the American Republic, no matter how corrupted its leaders, people, and activity in the world, stands as an institutional commitment to republicanism, the sovereignty of a nation created under God, a constitutional commitment to the General Welfare, and the proposition that all men are endowed by their Creator with the inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Late in the nineteenth century, it appeared that the monarchy had succeeded in gutting this U.S. commitment from within. Especially after the accession of Teddy Roosevelt, the United States became more and more of an ally of the British Empire, providing the muscle for implementing oligarchical aims of geopolitics, racism, and debt collection. But the British were acutely aware of the fact that this situation was unstable, as long as U.S. integrity under the Consti-

tution was preserved. They were bitterly reminded of this fact under President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who had the nerve to challenge British Prime Minister Winston Churchill's racist colonialism.

President John F. Kennedy also represented a challenge to British geopolitics, but he was quickly cut down, as part of a wave of British intelligence-instigated assassinations and upheavals in the 1960s.

The U.S. presidency was once again brought basically to heel, until the emergence of President William Clinton. Clinton, who had himself been trained in England and gone through all the "right" clubs, was supposed to be another toady of the British, but he's shown emphatically that he understands the British establishment to be inimical to the United States. Given the remaining power of the U.S. presidency, if President Clinton were to buck the Anglophile establishment of the United States, including the Federal Reserve System, the British see reason to fear.

Venetian methods

It has never been the British, or Venetian, or oligarchical way to take an enemy head-on, when such an exposure could be avoided. The method of the oligarchy is like that of Iago in Shakespeare's *Othello*: insinuation, treachery, lies, turning potential allies against one another. It was this strategy which was used in creating the allegedly religious Thirty Years' War (1618-48), which destroyed Central Europe for a generation, and in creating World War I. The method of warfare has been dubbed "irregular" by the late German law professor and scholar Prof. Dr. Freiherr August von der Heydte, in that it is fought without strict lines of battle, through surrogates, guerrillas, and with massive use of psychological warfare.

These methods are characteristic of the British global war against the United States today. Never ones to have respect for human life, the British monarchy is willing to fight the Clinton administration down to the last Bosnian, African, or Asian.

One of the notable aspects of the current phase of this war was reflected in the speech by Prince Charles to the RIIA Chatham House conference on March 29. Charles, like his evil father, Prince Philip, has invested a considerable amount of effort in cultural warfare, especially on the so-called religious front. Much of the targeting has been against Islam, as Charles's remarks indicate:

"Britain has to play the role of the bridge between the Islamic world and the West. It seems to me that the 'historic links' that Britain traditionally has had with the Muslims, despite the immense potential of experience it has acquired about the Muslim society, qualifies us to play this role, the role of bridge builders and 'interpreters' of the religion."

The actual significance of this alleged (actually false) sympathy for Islam is indicated in many of the case studies in this package:

The British monarchy and its think-tanks are up to their eyeballs in fostering terrorist groups, both in the name of Islam and in the name of fighting Islam! In addition, the cultural aspect of the House of Windsor's warfare cultivates or creates terrorist outfits among other religious groups, or anti-religious groups.

The reality of the matter is that, while pretending to extend its hand to Islam, the British intelligence services have been right in the middle of fostering the bloody civil strife in Palestine, Algeria, Bosnia, Sudan, and Pakistan—to name only a few places. On the other side, seeking to promote dialogue around concrete issues that will permit peaceful co-existence, especially economic development, has been the United States.

The other hallmark of the Venetian method is to attempt at all points to undermine the authority of the nation-state, and national sovereignty. Thus the methods which the British promote in purporting to try to solve problems of ethnic discrimination or human rights abuses, is invariably oriented toward destroying the national government of the targeted state—and, not surprisingly, exacerbating the conflicts already existing.

This author is reminded of the classic case of the British role in the fight over slavery in the United States. On the one hand, the British were the strongest financial and intelligence backers of the Southern slaveholders and their Northern merchant colleagues. On the other hand, the British were the prime public funders and propagandists against slavery, promulgating the Wilberforce doctrine in the 1830s, sponsoring the Abolition Movement, and so forth. In the case of the slavery fight, it is not hard to see the method in this supposedly contradictory policy: The British were attempting to break up and destroy the United States. It took intelligent leaders—like Frederick Douglass and Abraham Lincoln—to avoid the emotional traps set by the British intelligence warfare, and to fight to preserve the national institutions which were required in order to eliminate slavery and build a future for the former slaves.

The global battleground

In the pages that follow, we present a map of the global conflicts, as well as a number of case studies. Note that the swath of irregular warfare overlaps all the areas of crucial economic development projects which are required to reverse the breakdown caused by the collapse of the international financial system. They follow the "Arc of Crisis" which Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski had outlined back in the 1970s. They reach into the very heart of Asia, the most densely populated area of the world.

Recognition of the role of British intelligence in this global war, and resistance by patriots throughout the world, can mean the difference between losing hundreds of millions of lives, and creating the conditions for a just new economic order for all nations.