

The Windsors created environmentalism

Without the top-down initiative of the House of Windsor and the Club of the Isles, the hoax of modern environmentalism would have never even gotten off the ground. The launching of the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), personally, by Britain's Prince Philip, and the Netherlands' Prince Bernhard, in 1961, was a benchmark event in the process of building a mass irrationalist, anti-science, grass-roots movement, throughout the advanced sector, and now, even in the developing world. The role of the Anglo-Dutch oligarchy in this effort was exposed in a series of recent *EIR* feature stories, beginning with "The Coming Fall of the House of Windsor."

Prior to the blossoming of the drug-rock-sex counterculture in the late 1960s, which provided the irrationalist cannon fodder for the mass-based "green" movement, environmentalism was a gentleman's sport, dominated by members of the British royalty, the House of Lords, and the corporate giants of the Club of the Isles. In fact, in the mid-1960s, Prince Philip and Prince Bernhard launched the 1001 Club, a select group of 1,001 wealthy individuals, who each donated at least \$10,000, to a \$10 million kitty to bankroll WWF, and a number of its spin-off groups, such as Friends of the Earth, Greenpeace, and the Sierra Club, as well as later more hard-core eco-terrorist gangs, like Earth First!. To this day, the radical environmentalist movement receives billions of dollars in tax-exempt cash from leading British and American "philanthropies" to spread their poisonous hoax.—*Jeffrey Steinberg*

California, charging that they had been defrauded by Lloyd's, and charging Lloyd's with violations of the RICO statute. U.S. District Judge Irma Gonzalez dismissed the case in May 1995, saying that "the SEC consistently has exempted Lloyd's from the registration requirements of securities laws. . . . We are extremely reluctant to dispute the SEC's apparent judgment."

The Names were more successful in Texas, where they had a chance to present their evidence of fraud. In August 1995, U.S. District Judge John D. Rainey of Houston issued a blistering ruling in the case of *Leslie v. Lloyd's*, accusing Lloyd's of "attempting to circumvent U.S. securities laws." By entering the U.S. market, Rainey ruled, Lloyd's "elected to subject themselves to the anti-fraud and disclosure requirements of the United States securities laws." Rainey found that

"neither Lloyd's nor Sturge disclosed important information, available to Lloyd's insiders, about asbestos and pollution risks and the 'loading' of outside syndicates," and that "Leslie's accession to the forum selection clause was the product of fraud on the part of Lloyd's and Sturge." "If any reasonable outside Name had known what insiders at Lloyd's knew in the summer of 1986, that Name most certainly would have preferred to terminate or suspend his or her underwriting activity at Lloyd's," Rainey concluded.

Judge Rainey's decision was overturned by the appellate court, which ruled that the case must be heard in England.

Unable to get justice in the federal courts, the Names launched a campaign to enlist state securities regulators to protect them against Lloyd's predatory practices.

In September 1995, the Arizona Corporation Commission filed an administrative order against Lloyd's, Sturge, and Falcon agencies, charging Lloyd's with "fraud on Arizona Names," "fraud in connection with the offer and sale of securities," "asbestos fraud," "omissions of material facts," the "offer and sale of unregistered securities," "transactions by unregistered dealers and salesmen," and "aiding and abetting liability." The action ordered Lloyd's "to cease and desist from the conduct alleged and from doing any act in furtherance thereof, including, but not limited to, drawing on any letters of credit posted by the Arizona Names, pursuing any lawsuits to collect against the Arizona Names or foreclosing on any collateral pledged by the Arizona Names."

In October, the Illinois Department of Securities took similar actions. "These charges reflect the fact that Lloyd's of London knowingly and consistently ignored Illinois securities law," said Illinois Secretary of State George Ryan.

In December 1995, Colorado State Judge Robert Hyatt, at the request of Colorado Securities Commissioner Philip Feigin, issued a preliminary injunction against Lloyd's, prohibiting Lloyd's from collecting funds from Colorado Names. Hyatt ruled that "the Court specifically finds that Lloyd's is offering to sell and selling securities in the State of Colorado in violation of Section 301 of the Act"; that "Lloyd's has failed to disclose significant material facts to Colorado Names, specifically . . . the quantity and nature of asbestos- and pollution-related claims"; and that Lloyd's had made "statements [that] are materially misleading and false."

In February 1996, the California Corporations Commission asked the court to issue a temporary restraining order against Lloyd's, and sought to place a lien on the \$12.6 billion Lloyd's American Trust Fund, held at Citibank in New York. The Corporations Commission said that "Lloyd's fraudulently misrepresented and did not fully disclose the risks involved."

"The Department has taken this action to protect the interests of Californians who have been fraudulently induced into investing hundreds of millions of dollars by an operation well aware of the undisclosed and unlimited risks in such investments," said Corporation Commissioner Gary