
Duke of York & '9-11':

Some Things Just Leak Out

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Nov. 30—The ghost of “9-11” passed, like a chilling breath, through the meeting, as Britain’s special trade minister, Andrew, the Duke of York, coddled the Brits in the audience. He also shocked those foreign press and dignitaries, whose thoughts might have strayed, appropriately, to the connection between the BAE’s Al-Yamamah and the Saudi kingdom, as being adducible to the truly witting from the keynoted theme of his colorfully flavored remarks to the audience. Otherwise, his unfavorable view of the *Guardian* on this account was also a notably related enhancement of this peculiarly notable occasion.

The Duke may certainly not have wished to bring the “9-11” matter directly into that discussion, but, whether intended or not, he did imply just that effect in more ways than one. What the Duke did, on this account, was to bring two distinct aspects of Britain’s role to an ironically juxtaposed, common point, that in more or less the same ironical fashion employed by Johannes Kepler in the world’s original discovery of the general principle of universal gravitation.

On the one aspect, the BAE connection through Al-Yamamah to the Saudi Kingdom of such as Prince Turki, was called to mind. On the second count, the relationship of the British Al-Yamamah connection to the Saudi Kingdom’s part in the proposed early military attacks on Iran was brought to the attention of the sentient audience attending and of the broader circulation of these remarks to the world’s press, by aid of attention to the “WikiLeaks.” As if to be certain that



Agencia Brasil

The “cocky and rude” Prince Andrew, Duke of York, spilled the beans in Kyrgyzstan in 2008.

such connections might not be overlooked, the Prince’s presentation was made the more eye-catching by the Prince’s picking a fight with a prominent member of the British press, the *Guardian*. It will prove rather difficult, to conceal the point of the matter under a diversionary heap of references to a mass of “WikiLeaks,” especially to the matter of the British hand in the reported Saudi backing for warfare against Iran.

There are two general categories of major press-leaked scandals. One type is mostly a few headlines, with slim substance in the body of the texts; another, is one in which the attempt is made to conceal a major scandal by means of a diversionary attempt at a change of the subject to a more superficial matter of substance, as has been done in much of the handling of the “WikiLeaks” flap.

What I have just written above, so far, were sufficient for the cognoscenti; but, what the British have to fear from the Duke’s remarks, lies not in the content of the words themselves, but in the peculiar ripeness of the hyper-inflationary potential of an oncoming general, global economic breakdown-crisis centered on the British system’s presently crumbling imperial monetarist Inter-Alpha Group launched as a replacement for the fixed-exchange-rate system in 1971. Worry about matches captures the mind’s attention best when the neighborhood has been set afire.

The only financial means available for attempting to conceal the authorship of the execution of the U.S.A.’s “9-11” events, has been located in a certain gap between the price of Saudi petroleum at the exits from its port of origin, and the price of the same petroleum as a product nominally priced for resale in the European spot market. The only visible means for securing a relevant amount of difference between the two prices needed for funding an operation known as “9-11,” points the finger of qualified suspicion in the direction of the Al-Yamamah channel. This is of particular significance in light of what was put on the record as the role of certain pilots, who had received financial assistance through the charity of official Saudi channels toward a certain two na-

tionals who had turned up as pilots in the “9-11” operation.

Then, add to that already lurking connection, the WikiLeaks respecting the commitment of Saudi elements to the projected warfare plans against Iran.

Kepler, wherever he may be today, might nod in recognition of the principled aspects of the matter in our present time.

When Nations and Editors Think Small

What any truly qualified British intelligence figure would have to admit, at least to himself, or herself, would be, that much of the British empire’s strategic success is owed to the credulity of the nations it sets into warfare against one another, all to the net advantage of British imperial interests. So, the Venetian potencies averted much of the threat posed by the Fifteenth-century Florentine renaissance, by plunging all of Europe into a permanent state of warfare, between the 1492 expulsions of Jews from Spain and the end of that monstrous warfare by the action of the 1648 Peace of Westphalia.

So, the British empire of Lord Shelburne’s East India Company triumphed by organizing the continental European warfare of 1756-63. So, the British empire of that same Lord Shelburne, created the British Foreign Office in 1782 as the vehicle crafted to orchestrate a reign of warfare on the continent of Europe, a warfare which extended from the initial diplomatic set-ups by Shelburne in 1782, past the shared triumph of the British Foreign Office and Prince Metternich in 1815, and beyond.

So, the British empire, finding its imperial power in geopolitical jeopardy through the European continental extensions of what had been accomplished by the U.S.A.’s trans-continental railway system, arranged the termination of the services of Chancellor Bismarck, and crafted sundry consequent contributions to a permanent state of geopolitical disorder throughout the world, a policy of what British weapons trafficker Alexander Helphand (“Parvus”) employed as his famous recipe: “permanent warfare, permanent revolution,” a theme which has continued as the implicitly continued state of conflict, permanently, throughout more or less all of the planet. Such was the state of geopolitical conflict since the assassination of France’s President Sadi Carnot and the launching of the British alliance with Japan for the wars against China, Korea, and Russia of the first two decades fol-

lowing the ouster of Bismarck, and for the continuous states of general warfare or preparations for such geopolitical conflicts up through the present date, as in Southwest Asia since two wars against Iraq, and the permanent state of warfare in Afghanistan since the relevant tenure of the notorious Anglophile Zbigniew Brzezinski.

Beyond Brzezinski

Now, the British geopolitical interest has led much of the governing political forces of Europe, and beyond, into what is frankly identified as the intention for the “End of the Westphalian System.”

From the beginning of this period of geopolitical conflict which had begun with Bismarck’s post-1876 adoption of Henry C. Carey’s reports to Europe on the principle of “The American System of political economy,” the possibility of establishing a “post-Westphalian system” of empire had depended on breaking the United States through inducing internal corruption within the U.S.A.; London’s organization of what become the Confederacy, expressed this intention. Since January 2001, we had now reached, under the recently elected U.S. President George W. Bush, Jr., and, presently, the mentally disturbed President Barack Obama, the point at which the great British gamble of creating a “post-Westphalian system” has obviously appeared to some in London, to be a likely venture.

What the British empire had actually gained in this fashion, was the presently immediate prospect of a very near, pathetic disintegration of the world’s present trans-Atlantic system, a breakdown which the leading Asian nations, by themselves, could not endure in physical terms.

To bring about the present prospect of a global victory for a global British empire, Shelburne’s distant dream of a new Roman empire under British reign, is now impossible. The horror of the Fourteenth-century New Dark Age, is the relevant precedent for an attempted establishment of empire, now. The ironically suitable remark would be the useful pun, that today’s Venetians have been “blinder than ever.”

So, the Delphic promise of a great empire’s fall, is on the verge of the present moment, unless we prudently change from our presently foolish ways.

That should provide Prince Andrew with the opportunity to consider improving upon his recent speech, and upon the opinions it had been assigned to express.