

In the wake of Britain's wedding: social controllers see new feudal order

by Mark Burdman

Q: What do you estimate to be the psycho-sociological and political significance of the royal wedding in London?

A: Well, in general, spectacles like this are rather diversionary. But I would like to make the more general observation that most people want something like the institution of the monarchy. People want leaders over them, rulers like monarchs. I would say that the anti-royalists are a small minority in the world, although they've gotten all the publicity. People want a ruler. We've studied 100 cultures all over the world and we can say this definitively. It's basic human nature to have a leader, as is the case with a pack of wolves.

Q: You compare human behavior to a pack of wolves?

A: Yes, surely. Most animals do have a leader, so why should the human animal be any different? That's the lesson we've drawn from studies of many primitive tribes. It's clear: basic human needs cannot be changed. . . .

Q: How does this view correspond to what we've seen in the case of Fascism, Hitler, Mussolini, and so on?

A: It's basically the same thing. Hitler and his appeal to the youth movement of Germany expressed the Germans' need to have a strong leader; it's the same kind of process. . . .

Q: And in terms of the spectacles you've talked about, are you referring to the Roman circuses organized by the Roman emperors, that kind of thing?

A: Yes, that's right. There have been countless examples throughout the ages, but that's the kind of thing.

—Excerpts from a July 30 interview with Dr. David Nias, "academic psychologist" at the London Institute of Psychiatry, and associate of racist I.Q. theorist Dr. H. J. Eysenck of the same institution.

The above comments by Eysenck associate David Nias on the July 29 extravaganza in London are only a brutally frank expression of the sentiments expressed in a more private and sedate manner by the inner circles of the royal family itself and its friends in the aristocracies of Venice, Geneva, and Munich.

For these royalist circles, as expressed overtly by many of their favored press conduits in Britain and Continental Europe since the wedding, that event and the media brainwashing overkill that accompanied it, are designed to usher in a new political order throughout Europe, including Eastern Europe. This "new order" will be characterized by the short-term imposition of fascist crisis-management regimes, often presided over by restored monarchies, to replace existing parliamentary and proto-parliamentary regimes. These fascist regimes are to provide law and order over populations driven into chaos and desperation by the financial collapse now being engineered by the same royalist families and associated financial institutions.

George III at the helm in England?

In the words of Dr. Nias, the new system emerging will conform to the "philosophy of Thomas Hobbes," the 17th-century British philosopher-bestialist who espoused that a universal "war of all against all" could only be "managed" by brutally repressive kings and queens.

According to "psychiatrist" Dr. Nias, "People now need some structure to their life, that's the key thing. People are now not sure what they're doing; there's uncertainty, so we're getting unrest. So we need more structures, to make life more *predictable*. Concretes are sometimes hard to specify, but I guess you can say that the words 'law and order' communicate best what I'm saying."

In the weeks leading to the Charles-Diana fantasia,

EIR had consistently warned that such a royalist reordering was being made operational. *EIR*'s investigation into the Venetian-run P-2 Freemasonic lodge had ascertained that the lodge's terrorism, financial warfare, and associated destabilization activities were all aimed at creating the conditions for the return of the House of Savoy to the throne in Italy and for parallel restorations to be carried out elsewhere in Western Europe.

If the House of Windsor succeeds in its current plans, P-2 Grand Master Licio Gelli's conspiracy will be realized early in this decade.

As *EIR* has previously indicated, the first step in this process could well be to dump Margaret Thatcher in Britain and to have Prince Charles emerge as the prototype "strongman" monarch. The adulation accorded Charles in recent days certainly points in that direction. Hardly had the wedding ceremony ended when the British press wildly escalated its anti-Thatcher campaign. The Aug. 2 London *Observer* went so far as to speculate that Thatcher would be "ditched" and replaced by Lord Carrington—an act which would necessitate a revision of British law prohibiting a Lord from succeeding to the premiership. Obviously, such a revision could pave the way for the indicated P-2-centered conspiracy.

The practical political-economic implications of such a development in Britain were stated in a July 29 article in the arch-Fabian London *Guardian* by "investment columnist" Robin Stoddart. "Restoration of an absolute monarchy, or at any rate one with the hiring and firing powers of an early George III [the lunatic king against whom the American Revolution was fought] might be the quickest, if most unlikely solution to the social divisions that today's celebrations can only temporarily gloss over," Stoddart wrote. "The failure of monetarist policy [i.e., Thatcher's] even in terms of its own false and futile statistics is complete. . . . Cementing the social structures is the overriding obligation of governments."

Preliminary investigation indicates that the extension of the scenario into the rest of Europe would largely involve the royalty that attended the wedding under the pretext of familial attachment to the House of Windsor. For example, King Constantine of Greece was described by Buckingham Palace as "King of the Hellenes." This so irked the Greek government that Prime Minister Karamanlis refused to attend the wedding because, as the July 28 *Daily Telegraph* noted, "the title given to [Constantine] suggests he is still Greece's ruling monarch."

'These are not normal times'

The broader European implications were drawn, not surprisingly, by the Munich newspaper *Suddeutsche Zeitung*; Munich is the most entrenched royalist area of

Europe. The *Zeitung* July 29 praised the German-connected House of Windsor and took pains to note that the media—most of whose controllers in the U.S., U.K., and Europe were trained by the British monarchy's intelligence services—are using the wedding to brainwash the population.

"What do we have Prince Charles, Lady Diana and also the Queen for?" the *Zeitung* queried. "Naturally, for the people. They are 'ours,' and not only the rulers of the English. . . . To say it more precisely, we have a claim on the Windsors; in their veins also flow German blood. And, to be fair, the English royal house deserves our admiration. They did not, like the members of the Dutch, Danish, or Norwegian royal families, descend to climbing on bicycles. The lowest thing Queen Elizabeth ever descended to was the back of a horse. Thus, we can still look up to her and her family. This, the English monarchy, is the only one which still maintains some of the mystery of godly descent. This is not something to laugh about. *Every fifth inhabitant of the earth will sit in front of the TV screen today. Only a very few of them will be conscious whether they are republicans or monarchists* (emphasis added)."

A different version of the same diatribe was launched later by arch-Tory Peregrine Worsthorne in the London *Sunday Telegraph*. Deriding Britain's main politicians as "lesser fry," Worsthorne exulted: "the roles are being reversed. It is the modern democratic institutions which seem increasingly ritualistic and archaic, unable to cope with its contemporary job. . . . When Buckingham Palace takes over, things work. . . . Of all Britain's institutions, only the monarchy today has vastly increased its authority."

On the role of the media, Worsthorne continued, "Let us stop talking about the magic of monarchy as if what happened last week was the result of some medieval spell. The spell, if spell it be, has been brought up to date, and is as good as new, if not better, owing quite as much to modern techniques of media manipulation as to ancient rituals whose origins are buried in the mists of time. . . . The blood royal is patently a potent elixir, a transfusion of which the body politic desperately needs, not in dribs and drabs every so often, but regularly, in the main artery."

And in case the point was not made, Worsthorne added: "No, I am not going to invite ridicule by prophesying some kind of eventual restoration under King Charles III. But on the other hand, it would be equally ridiculous to ignore this monarchical phenomenon which grows ever more sensational. Conventional wisdom would have us believe that the monarchy is reversed precisely because it is above the political battle, and would soon cease to be revered if it sought in any way to intervene in the fray. In normal circumstances, yes. But these are not normal times."