

Teddy Goldsmith works with eco-terrorists and Al Gore

by Scott Thompson

Teddy Goldsmith, the brother of the late billionaire Sir James Goldsmith, runs *The Ecologist*, a British-based magazine which has been used to propagate the “Gaia” or “Earth Mother” hypothesis. If *The Ecologist* sounds like a manual for eco-terrorists who intend to wreak revenge upon those who violate “Mother Nature’s” rule, that is no surprise. In the following interview, Teddy Goldsmith reveals that he has been working with Reclaim the Streets, a group which has been at the center, along with the self-proclaimed eco-terrorist group Earth First!, in the June 18, 1999 riots in the City of London and at Stonehenge during the summer solstice, and again most recently during the Nov. 30-Dec. 3 World Trade Organization (WTO) meeting in Seattle. Also not surprisingly, Goldsmith has been working closely over the years with Vice President Al Gore, Jr., whose “deep ecology” book, *Earth in the Balance: Ecology and the Human Spirit*, cannot be distinguished, when passages are laid side-by-side, from the Unabomber’s manifesto.

According to Earth First! sources, the coalition which disrupted the WTO summit in Seattle, included such organizations as: Direct Action Network; Rainforest Action Network; Ruckus Society; Project Underground; and, the Seattle branch of the Green Party (the British branch was founded by Teddy Goldsmith). As Earth First! documents illustrate, this was a carefully planned disruption, which included eco-terrorists wearing black ski masks, who attacked police before changing clothes to blend back in with the crowd, of legitimate anti-free-trade protesters.

Also, according to sources at the Gaia Foundation, which the Goldsmith brothers have funded, Teddy Goldsmith has been working closely with Britain’s Princes Philip and Charles, who, as *EIR* previously reported, had a seminal influence upon Vice President Gore’s book and with whom Gore has maintained contact on issues dealing with their mutual admiration for eco-fascism.

Through the International Forum on Globalization, of which Teddy Goldsmith is a board member, there has been an international campaign to put forward a delphic attack against WTO-style “globalization.” One of the more insidious efforts in this respect, is “The Siena Declaration on the Crisis of Economic Globalization,” published as an advertisement in the Nov. 20, 1998 issue of the *New York Times*. At first glance, the declaration appears quite sane. It charges that “economic globalization” has led to “an extreme volatility in

global financial markets and great vulnerability for all nations and people.” It pins the blame on supranational organizations that set “the rules of global trade and investment,” including the WTO. The declaration gives support to the “serious corrective action,” including capital controls and reining in currency speculation, of the sort that has been taken by Malaysia, India, China, and other countries.

But on closer examination, matters begin to look quite suspect. The Siena Declaration historically locates the source of the plague of globalization in the original Bretton Woods conference of 1944. This is tantamount to holding U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt to blame for today’s maladies, and ignores the fact that the original Bretton Woods accords provided a viable basis for economic growth internationally until the mid-1960s, when a “paradigm shift” toward “post-industrial society” and “ecologist” policies, and the Aug. 15, 1971 introduction of a “floating exchange rate” system by President Richard Nixon, destroyed the last vestiges of FDR’s vision embodied in the Bretton Woods system.

Readers should not be taken in by such statements that Goldsmith made in the following interview with Scott Thompson on Dec. 16, where Goldsmith appears at times to be almost sane. It is all part of a “bodyguard of lies,” to misdirect the growing international movement against “globalization” and British neo-liberal “free trade” practices.

Interview: Teddy Goldsmith

Q: I was calling to ask you whether your Siena Group is still active?

Goldsmith: Well, the Siena Group was really nothing more than the board meeting of the International Forum on Globalization. So, the persons who actually did the writing of it was a group of us. It’s the board of the IFG. I happen to be a member, and I happened to have a house in Siena. . . .

Q: Have you supported any actions? For example, I noticed in Seattle at the World Trade Organization meeting on globalization, that there were a number of people from England there—

Goldsmith: Yeah.

Q: Did you give any support to that blockage of the WTO globalization push?

Goldsmith: There were more than a dozen people there who are supported by us in any case, whether they go to Seattle or not, you see. We supported people, of course. Seattle is the most important thing that's happened. . . . I mean, I wanted to go, but I didn't quite make it. But, it is very important. So, any foundation that funds things of any value in the environment has got to give some support to everything that led up to Seattle.

Q: I see. As I understand it from reading the Earth First! newsletter, there were actually demonstrations that got less coverage that were support demonstrations for Seattle. For example, there were 5,000 people who demonstrated in Geneva near the headquarters of the WTO. There were people as far away as Nepal—

Goldsmith: And, in England, too, there were demonstrations: in London. . . . And, that was rather badly described. It was described in the English papers as saying: "London is on fire," "London is in flames." In fact, the only thing that was burnt was one police car. So, London was not in flames. And, the people who burnt it have got nothing with the environmentalists. I mean the people I'm connected with are not involved in violence. . . . I mean the International Forum on Globalization is very, very serious people: some of the best scholars in

this whole field. These are serious people. . . . So, we've got nothing to do with violence. There were small violent groups that turned up there, but we've had nothing to do with them. . . .

Q: You don't know who the people in London were?

Goldsmith: Well, I don't know what they were called. The main body that demonstrated in London, which was, again, a non-violent body, is called Reclaim the Streets. And as far as I know, they are not involved in violence. My son went to one of their meetings the other day, and they're extremely, you know, perfectly peaceful people. They believe there are too many cars, and they've got to get back the streets again. They're quite right. How could anyone question that? . . . Even Vice President Gore doesn't like all that.

Q: Have you had the opportunity of talking with Vice President Gore. He wrote a book called *The Earth*—

Goldsmith: Yes, I know, I know President Gore [sic]. I had dinner with him—

Q: Oh, you had dinner with him?

Goldsmith: I'm involved with some students, whom we take around the world looking at environmental problems. And, when they come to Washington, D.C., President Gore [sic] lectures to them.

EIR SPECIAL REPORT

The True Story Behind The Fall of the House of Windsor

Reprints of EIR's 1994-1997 groundbreaking exposés

What political battles lie behind the assassination of Princess Diana?
Why do 22 out of 30 top terrorist groups have their headquarters in London?
EIR's series on the House of Windsor is indispensable for understanding today's news.

The Coming Fall of the House of Windsor
(Oct. 28, 1994)

The Sun Never Sets on the New British Empire
(May 24, 1996)

Britain's "Invisible" Empire Unleashes the Dogs of War,
(Aug. 22, 1997)

**Epilogue:
Can the House of Windsor Survive Diana's Death?**
(Sept. 12, 1997)

Order from:

EIR News Service

P.O. Box 17390 Washington, D.C. 20041-0390 Order number EIR 97-004 **\$75**



Q: Ah, I know when I talked with Maurice Strong—

Goldsmith: I know Maurice Strong well.

Q: You know him very well?

Goldsmith: Well, not very well; it's not true. But, I mean I've known him, since he ran the United Nations Conference on the Environment in Stockholm in 1972. . . . And, that year David Blair . . . —He's a sort of father of the environmental movement in the United States. He started Friends of the Earth long ago, before it became that. He and I, we did this paper together. We did a daily paper for the delegates to that meeting in 1972. . . .

Anyway, what was it you were going to ask about Maurice Strong?

Q: Well, I was just going to say that Maurice Strong had told me that one of the influences on Al Gore, when he wrote *Earth in the Balance*, was your Prince Philip and Prince Charles.

Goldsmith: Well, yes, both of them are very concerned with environmental matters. . . . And, Prince Charles even more so than his father.

Q: How so?

Goldsmith: Indeed, Prince Charles is very much involved in these things. He understands. I mean, he's very much involved in organic agriculture. His father is not entirely organic. He [Prince Charles] is very much involved in that. He gives wonderful talks on it. He's very much in the battle against genetic engineering.

Q: Of course, Prince Philip was president of—

Goldsmith: The World Wildlife Fund. The World Wildlife Fund does not take quite such a strong stand on most issues, as you know. It's largely funded by industry. . . . I must say they do not take such a strong line. I'm not saying they're useless. And, they vary according to the country, you see. World Wildlife Fund in Geneva are very anti-nuclear. And, in France, they're pro-nuclear. They vary you see. They're not the same everywhere. . . .

Q: So, what's next on the anti-globalization agenda?

Goldsmith: Well, the globalization agenda has taken a beating. You see, what is happening now, is, that President Clinton realizes which way the wind is blowing. He's a good politician. He's always number one with the heart of the people who demonstrated in Seattle: the trade unionists. And, they don't want to have too much cheap labor about. So, they're going to make a big fuss if they bring China into the WTO.

So, I don't think he will want to associate himself with any move to bring China into the WTO today. He may have done it a few weeks ago, but I betcha he doesn't do it today or his friend Gore is not going to get in.

Loudoun Democrats are challenged for racist practices

by Nancy Spannaus

LaRouche Democrats in Loudoun County, Virginia have appealed the outcome of the Dec. 9, 1999 reorganization of the Loudoun County Democratic Committee, to the Virginia Democratic Party's 10th District Committee. According to the appeal, issued on Dec. 22 and signed by 10 Loudoun Democrats, the Loudoun reorganization "was riddled, from top to bottom, with fraudulent, racist, intimidating tactics, which violate the spirit and the letter of the U.S. Constitution, the Charter of the Democratic Party of the United States, the Voting Rights Act, and the Virginia Democratic Party Plan."

In many respects, this travesty in Loudoun, where LaRouche lives, reflects what will happen to the Democratic Party nationally, if the racist cabal within the Democratic National Committee, led by former DNC Chairman Don Fowler and DNC attorney Jack Keeney, Jr., is permitted to get away with its violation of the 1965 Voting Rights Act, in its treatment of 1996 Democratic Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche. Keeney has argued before the Washington courts that the DNC is prepared to see the Voting Rights Act nullified, in order to be able to exclude LaRouche, who is seeking the Democratic nomination again this year.

This racist argument, by the son of one of the principal architects in the Department of Justice of the racist Operation Fruhmenschen targetting of black elected office holders and prominent citizens, Assistant Deputy Attorney General Jack Keeney, has set off a firestorm in the national Democratic Party, particularly among African-American leaders. Hundreds of African-Americans, civil rights leaders, and other Democratic and constituency leaders have signed an ad demanding that the DNC repudiate Keeney's tactics. The ad has now appeared in more than two dozen African-American papers around the country.

The Loudoun County Democratic Committee (LCDC) leadership, around former Chairman Dave Whitmer, embraced the Keeney-Fowler argument in word and in deed.

Shocking exclusion

The Whitmer clique used a wide variety of methods in order to achieve its express aim of excluding LaRouche Democrats—who have comprised nearly half of the party in recent contests—from its newly reorganized Committee. These in-