

Editorial

Yes, Lord Rees-Mogg

"The Queen, the Dalai Lama and Me," is the headline of a front-page article in Lord William Rees-Mogg's slander sheet, *Strategic Investment*. The article, by Rees-Mogg himself, is little more than a primal scream of rage. While he is ostensibly protesting attacks on himself by Lyndon LaRouche and his associates, he is no doubt also speaking for his royal master, Prince Philip, as well.

How dare LaRouche expose Rees-Mogg's role in spreading the story right before the Oklahoma bombing, which was widely circulated among militia groups, that President Clinton intended to impose martial law; how dare LaRouche reveal that the Unabomber target list overlaps the target list of Earth First!, which in turn is part of the family tree of environmentalist organizations controlled by Prince Philip's World Wildlife Fund; how dare LaRouche point to the documented relationship of the Aum cult and Britain's darling, the Dali Lama; how dare LaRouche tell the truth? How, indeed!

How can LaRouche be so unkind to poor Rees-Mogg? The answer which Rees-Mogg gives to this question is quite revealing: Essentially, he says that LaRouche is trying to defend President Clinton from the dirty operations against Clinton, coming out of London.

In particular, Lord Rees-Mogg attacked LaRouche's remarks from a radio interview on "EIR Talks" on July 5. After learning of the attack, LaRouche compared Rees-Mogg to a character in an "Amos 'n Andy radio spoof." That show featured a character called "Kingfish," who headed the secret lodge called "Knights of the Mystic Sea." He was the kind of huckster who would try to sell the Brooklyn Bridge to anyone dumb enough to be willing to buy it. In this instance, LaRouche suggested that the British lord be called "Catfish," because he is so low-down, that he is scraping the bottom of the pond.

LaRouche remarked, "Curiously, or perhaps not so curiously, Rees-Mogg makes no effort to refute a single point in the passage from which he quotes. One might be reminded of the boy caught with his hand in the cookie-jar, shrieking at his mother, who has surprised him: 'What cookie-jar?' Not coincidentally, Rees-

Mogg's whimpering echoes a number of prominent British publications which have lambasted LaRouche's exposure of British targetting of President Bill Clinton. One might be prompted to ask Rees-Mogg: 'Have you bottom feeders managed to evolve to the level you have the ability to conspire?' "

In the radio broadcast of which Rees-Mogg complains, LaRouche made a more serious evaluation of Rees-Mogg, formerly chief editor of Rupert Murdoch's London *Times*, and that other British aristocrat, Sir Peregrine Worsthorne, who is with Conrad Black's London *Telegraph*. LaRouche said, "The British are in a hysterical fit, because, as these voices and others have stated, they now admit that the ongoing financial collapse is *foredoomed* to occur, and they're acting in desperation with the certainty that the collapse is ongoing and is virtually unstoppable. There's no bottom to this collapse.

"They are therefore escalating their operations against the United States, particularly against the Clinton administration, with the hope that the dismay thus imposed upon the United States, including Britain's efforts to accelerate that collapse, will bring a kind of government which will be submissive to London's direction. And thus, they're escalating everything. . . . But remember that the policy which the British are pushing—and it's the British who are pushing it, people shouldn't block on that, it's a simple fact. They are pushing, as they have, *as Prince Philip did* in Washington some years ago, a policy of breaking up the United States into a number of different partitions. . . .

"And if you look at the people who are behind the orchestration of the so-called populist rage against President Clinton, you will find that these people, who are being directed by the British monarchy, the circles around it, by Lord William Rees-Mogg, Ambrose Evans-Pritchard and so forth, are all preaching policies which would, in effect, break the United States up into parts, destroy the federal government, privatize everything in sight, and break it up."

This is the truth which Lord William Rees-Mogg cannot deny.