

Hollinger's Evans-Pritchard: Destroy the U.S. nation-state

by Edward Spannaus

If one wants a simple but efficient guidepost to the current operations of British intelligence-linked networks against the United States of America, there is probably no more readily available map of this subversion, than the pattern of activity of the Hollinger Corporations's Ambrose Evans-Pritchard. Wherever London is trying to stir up trouble in the United States, there one will most likely find Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, the Washington correspondent of the *Sunday Telegraph* of London.

Evans-Pritchard's published output for the month of December 1996, reflecting his travels and "field expeditions," consists of the following:

Dec. 8: In an article entitled "Indigenous Right-Wing Terrorism," Pritchard profiled the so-called Aryan Republican Army, which he called "the secret military arm of the American neo-Nazi movement." This was previewed by another Hollinger asset, Emmett Tyrrell, of the *American Spectator*, who wrote that "Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, the distinguished British journalist, is about to unveil . . . an alarming report on indigenous right-wing terrorism in America." The reason that Pritchard is able to come up with such great discoveries, Tyrrell explained, is that he treats his investigations in the United States "as a serious anthropological expedition." (Pritchard's "indigenous" American terrorists turned out to be a variant of the British-Israelite cult.)

Dec. 15: Clintongate. This time, Evans-Pritchard previewed a new scandal-piece being published in the *American Spectator*. "The inner circle is beginning to crack. David Watkins, the former director of administration in the Clinton White House, has decided to spill some beans in the next issue of the *American Spectator*." Pritchard then describes Watkins's allegations of sexual affairs in the White House, involving Bill Clinton, Hillary Clinton, the late Vincent Foster, and others.

Dec. 22: "Colombianization of America." Pritchard's field expedition took him to San Francisco and the local Cannabis Club. Claiming that the U.S. government is carrying out "draconian repression" in enforcing anti-drug laws, Pritchard predicts that decriminalization and states' rights are the wave of the future, and he declares that "America is in the incipient stages of 'Colombianization.'" He writes that the stage is set for "a spectacular clash between Washington and California. . . . The days are long gone when Washington could ride

roughshod over the states."

Dec. 29: Proposition 209 and the "despotic judiciary." For his last offering of the month, Evans-Pritchard declared the United States to be in the thrall of a "despotic judiciary," and retails the "theocon" line that the U.S. government is an "illegitimate regime that no longer has the moral authority to compel public obedience." His pretext is the action by the federal judge in California who issued an injunction against the enforcement of Proposition 209—the referendum passed in November which would outlaw all affirmative action programs in that state.

British Intelligence 'journalism'

Tyrrell's admission that Evans-Pritchard treats his "stint in the New World . . . as a serious anthropological expedition," is a confirmation of *EIR*'s evaluation of this Hollinger-British Intelligence asset, published over the period of Pritchard's prominence in the designing and orchestrating of the Whitewater and related scandals against President Clinton.

His father, Sir Edward Evan Evans-Pritchard, was a leading anthropologist who devoted his every effort to profiling colonial populations in the service of the British Empire and British Intelligence. In the 1930s and again in the 1950s, he conducted studies of the tribal structure in southern Sudan, which are still used by the British to foment tribal warfare.

Ambrose followed in his father's footsteps, but under journalistic cover. In the early 1980s, Ambrose spent over four years in Central America. He "befriended" the supposedly "right-wing" Nicaraguan Contras, as well as "left-wing" guerrillas in El Salvador and Guatemala. He also went to Chiapas, Mexico, where he interviewed the Zapatista guerrillas.

Pritchard went to Peru in 1986, to meet with the Shining Path narco-terrorists. The Peruvian connection is significant, in light of an item Pritchard dropped in his Dec. 29 article. He noted that one of the co-authors of Proposition 209 "is a cultural anthropologist named Glynn Custred," whom he describes as an "expert on Latin America—he did his doctoral field-work on the Quechua Indians in the highlands of Peru."

Custred is a professor of anthropology at California State University in Hayward, and he was indeed one of the two authors of Proposition 209—the deliberately misleadingly titled "California Civil Rights Initiative," which would make

illegal all hiring preferences and affirmative action programs. In 1974, Custred conducted “ethnographic research in Peru,” and he appears to be an expert on conflicts among linguistic and ethnic groups.

Accordingly, Pritchard quotes Custred as declaring, “Something very unpleasant is building up in this country. For the first time we’re seeing the emergence of white identity politics on a mass scale.”

Pritchard takes it further, adding the ferment around Proposition 209 to his compendium of reasons why U.S. citizens should destroy their government.

What is at issue here is the injunction issued by U.S. District Judge Thelton Henderson, temporarily barring California from implementing Proposition 209. Henderson said that the voter-approved measure probably violated the constitutional right to equal protection, and he stated—absolutely correctly—that “the will of the people” must be subordinated to the U.S. Constitution.

“It is not for this or any other court to lightly upset the expectations of the voters,” he said. “At the same time, our system of democracy teaches that the will of the people, important as it is, does not reign absolute but must be kept in harmony with our Constitution.”

Evans-Pritchard quotes columnist Thomas Sowell as saying: “What we are seeing is nothing less than the quiet repeal of the American Revolution and the piecemeal reinstatement of autocratic government. . . . Is there nothing left other than the choice of quietly surrendering democracy and refusing to obey court orders?”

Then, Pritchard lines up with the “theocons” of the Richard Neuhaus and Robert Bork stripe, those who are now virtually calling for the revolutionary overthrow of the United States government. Pritchard writes:

“In a symposium held this autumn by the intellectual journal *First Things*, a group of prominent thinkers concluded that the actions of the U.S. judiciary ‘add up to an entrenched pattern of government by judges that is nothing less than the usurpation of politics.’ They warned that ‘the U.S. experiment in popular democracy’ was in danger of failing: ‘What is happening now is the displacement of a constitutional order by a regime that does not have, will not obtain, and cannot command the consent of the people. There is a growing alienation of millions of Americans from a government they do not recognize as theirs . . . an erosion of moral adherence to this political system.’ ”

The growing alienation is true, but Pritchard and his London-centered backers hope to use this to promote separatism, “states’ rights,” and the destruction of the national government and the national sovereignty of the United States.

These guys ‘hate the United States’

In a Dec. 24 interview with “EIR Talks,” *EIR* Founding Editor Lyndon LaRouche was asked about Evans-Pritchard’s contention that the overturning of Proposition 209 in Califor-

nia is an example of judicial despotism, and that this is giving rise to things like the right-wing militia movement in the United States. LaRouche responded:

“So Ambrose Evans-Pritchard hopes. He’s obviously *openly* functioning as the coordinator for British intelligence of the general U.S. talk-show rabid attacks on President Clinton over the past several years. He is the architect of what George Bush’s man, Kenneth Starr, is trying to do to Clinton in the extrajudicial process he’s conducting. And, he’s a troublemaker.

“*These guys hate the United States.* They’re deadly afraid, that in a time of crisis, the United States will revert, under conditions of crisis, to a Franklin Delano Roosevelt reflex. That is, that the federal government will take the initiative to get us out of the mess, by putting things into bankruptcy reorganization that have to be put into bankruptcy reorganization to prevent chaos, to get people back to work as fast as possible, to prevent deaths from poverty from occurring, and to bring the world into some kind of order. And that certain fellows in London, and their friends around Bush in the United States do not want to have happen.

“And, behind the militia issue, we have the fact that 51% of the eligible voters did not vote in the recent federal election, *which means that nobody in Washington is operating with a national mandate!* . . . Because, increasingly, the majority of the American people, and this especially includes those under 35, have no confidence in government at the state or federal level, no confidence in either party, either major political party. . . .

“Now, in a sense, Ambrose Evans-Pritchard is perversely correct. But he, like the Marquis de Sade, is insane.

“Proposition 209 deepens the cleavage within the core constituencies of the Democratic Party, between the have-nots, or those who feel themselves to be, racially or otherwise, on the short end of being have-nots, and the rest of the population.

“This tears apart the political structure of the country, which obviously pleases Ambrose Evans-Pritchard very much. This was done successfully, because our people, those who voted, who bothered to vote, are very upset, and have been conned into believing that their problems are due to high tax rates. And, they are told that it is welfare cheats and other people who are the cause of their suffering. And therefore, they voted in a bigoted, disgusting manner, to do a terrible thing, which ought to be outlawed, because the Federal Constitution provides certain guarantees to all of the citizens, rights which no state has the legal power to abrogate, just as no state has the power to legalize drugs. This is a question of national welfare; and, under the general welfare clause of the Federal Constitution, this is a matter which is reserved to the primary authority of the federal government, just as affirmative action is.

“But, anything that Ambrose Evans-Pritchard can encourage to cause trouble, he seems to like to do.”