

---

---

# HONI SOIT QUI MAL Y PENSE (SHAME ON HIM WHO THINKS ILL OF US)

A moment of reflection on the British oligarchical principle and the French Presidential Election of Emmanuel Macron of April 24, 2022

by Pierre Beaudry, 5/3/2022

---

---

## FOREWORD

The crisis hitting the Western World today is caused by the most profound axiomatic transformation that mankind has been subjected to. What is being put into question is: “What’s in it for me?” The most remarkable aspect of this matter of principle is that the entire political leadership of the trans-Atlantic region has been contaminated and is going through the same self-destructive process, at the same time, and for the same reason.



The time has come to identify the hidden reason behind this self-destructive process and to do away with the British oligarchical policy principle which is behind it, and which says: “HONI SOIT QUI MAL Y PENSE” (SHAME ON HIM WHO THINKS ILL OF US). This British chivalric provocation has finally reached its limit of acceptability.

Royal Coat of Arms of the United Kingdom<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The reader should pay attention to the fact that the British Royal motto is conveniently hiding four words: HONI SOIT QUI MAL Y PENSE. Only HONI...PENSE (SHAME ... THINK) is visible.

Western political leaders have not only forgotten the lessons of the American and French Revolutions, but they have also clearly forgotten the historical lesson of the Hundred Years War when Edward III, King of England and Duke of Aquitaine, initiated the Order of the Garter in 1348.

Why would the British royals, to this day, continue to wear a silly garter and use the French language to brag about it? The official reason for adopting the French, “Dieu et mon droit” (God and my right) comes from William the conqueror, Duke of Normandy, who was victorious at the famous battle of Hastings (England) in 1066.<sup>2</sup> A century later, King Richard I (the Lion Hearted) who, after the battle of Gisors (France) in 1198, coined the French motto in order to impose his royal foot over Normandy, Aquitaine, and Anjou; and to rub in the fact that he was taking that “right” away from the first King of France, Philippe II.<sup>3</sup>

Today, we have a similar situation in which NATO leaders are attempting to invade Russia for the same reason: “What is in it for me?” Yet, English-American and European political leaders appear to have lost confidence in themselves and in their own ability to keep their populations and their national purpose under control, as if they were all becoming subservient to the new British Empire, “Global Britain.”

Political leaders no longer ask themselves the question: am I sure I can increase my own security by decreasing the security of others? Should I not be more concerned about the security of others rather than that of my own? Can we privatize the nation? How much longer can the hidden truth behind the British “Order of the Garter” motto survive? Why can’t it no longer be hidden behind the current fake diplomatic language?

French President Emmanuel Macron may have been having such questions in mind throughout the period of the just ended Presidential Elections, when he took public steps to reform the French diplomatic corps. He may have been happy

---

<sup>2</sup>French Morning Staff, [Why Is the U.K.'s Royal Coat of Arms in French?](#) January 13, 2022. First appeared in French Morning London, in 2019. Authored by Inès Lombarteix, [Pourquoi la devise de la monarchie britannique est-elle en français ?](#)

<sup>3</sup> Philippe II, otherwise known as Philippe Auguste, is the first monarch to be called “King of France” (*Rex Franciae*). All previous monarchs were called “King of the Franks.”

to win 58.54% of the vote cast, but he cannot avoid the knowledge that the vote represented merely 38.5 % of registered voters, which means that 61.5 % of all French voters rejected Macron. This is a victory by default. Is this really democracy?

In his writings on China, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz identified the true nature of the demise of such fake leadership as being the result of losing the “mandate from heaven”:

“§4 What harm, then, if some nation has found a remedy [for these evils]? Certainly the Chinese above all others have attained a higher standard. In a vast multitude of men they have virtually accomplished more than the founders of religious orders among us have achieved within their own narrow ranks. So great is obedience toward superiors and reverence toward elders, so religious, almost, is the relation of children toward parents, that for children to contrive anything violent against their parents, even by word, is almost unheard of, and the perpetrator seems to atone for his actions even as we make a parricide pay for his deed. Moreover, there is among equals, or those having little obligation to one another, a marvelous respect, and an established order of duties. To us, not enough accustomed to act by reason and rule, these smack of servitude; yet among them, where these duties are made natural by use, they are observed gladly. As our people have noticed in amazement, the Chinese peasants and servants, when they bid farewell to friends, or when they first enjoy the sight of each other after a long separation, behave to each other so lovingly and respectfully that they challenge all the politeness of European magnates. What then would you expect from the mandarins, or from Colai? Thus it happens that scarcely anyone offends another by the smallest word in common conversation. And they rarely show evidences of hatred, wrath, or excitement. With us respect and careful conversation last for hardly more than the first days of a new acquaintance--scarcely even that. Soon familiarity moves in and circumspection is gladly put away for a sort of freedom which is quickly followed by contempt, backbiting, anger, and afterwards enmity. It is just the contrary with the Chinese. Neighbors and even members of a family are so

held back by a hedge of custom that they are able to maintain a kind of perpetual courtesy.”<sup>4</sup>

But, what does Leibniz have to do with the French Presidential Elections and the British Coat of Arms, you ask? Here is the point that I would like you to think about.

### **FRENCH PRESIDENT MACRON'S AXIOMATIC DECEPTION ON THE MATTER OF DIPLOMATIC EDUCATION**

A year ago, on April 8, 2021, French President Emmanuel Macron announced the closure of the most prestigious Ecole Nationale d'Administration (ENA), the training school for the French elite system created after World War II, in 1945, by President Charles de Gaulle. The school represented an institution whose purpose was originally established with the aim of forming leaders chosen from all classes of society whose focus would be to serve the people. De Gaulle's purpose was to weed out the Nazi-allied Vichy administration and replace it with a system of meritocracy with the primary concern being the general welfare of all of the people. This objective was never fully realized and ENA became a new aristocratic and elitist institution instead. According to RFI News:

“At its inception after the World War II, 55 percent of ENA students came from modest income families. By the mid-2010s more than 70 percent of *Enarques* hailed from the upper classes of French society, with working-class representation falling to about 6 percent.

The objective of the institution's reform, according to Macron's office is ‘to offer the French people a closer, more efficient, more transparent and more benevolent public service.’”<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Gottfried Leibniz's [WRITINGS ON CHINA](#), Translated, with an Introduction, Notes, and Commentaries by Daniel J. Cook and Henry Rosemont Jr., OPEN COURT, Chicago and La Salle, Illinois, 1994.

<sup>5</sup> [Macron says "adieu" to the elite ENA civil service finishing school](#)

By closing down the Ecole Nationale d'Administration (ENA) and replacing it with the Institute of Public Service (ISP), Macron was showing the French population that he was putting an end to the elitism of French Chivalry, and made it appear as though he was answering the plight of the Gilets Jaunes (Yellow Vests) insurgency by eliminating the very source of the problem: elitist selection. But, what is the purpose of such an elitist selection? The purpose is to choose those who can best fool the people. From this premise, you can ask yourself the question: "Was Macron serious about changing ENA?"

It is important to note that in the recent period, four Presidents, Emmanuel Macron, Francois Hollande, Giscard D'Estaing, and Jacques Chirac had all been students of ENA and all had the opportunity to make changes. Macron's reform called for the elimination of favoritism in the choice of students, and for instituting an obligation for them to spend a significant amount of time in contact with the population of the provinces in order to better evaluate their needs, and thus prove that he was serious about bridging the gap between the governing class and the governed.<sup>6</sup>

More recently, on October 26, 2021, Politico announced that President Macron sacked the head of the French foreign ministry's Middle East and North Africa (MENA) diplomatic division, Christophe Farnaud, without giving any official explanation. The alleged reason was that the French President intended to get rid of France's "deep state" as he had warned his ambassadors in a speech made before them in 2019, especially when it came to French relations with Russia. Both the foreign ministry's press service and the Elysée Palace declined to make any comment at the time. Farnaud's responsibilities extended to Lebanon, Libya, Syria, and Algeria where he was doing the bidding of the British and American neocons policy.

Then, a few days ago, on April 19, 2022, it was reported by the United Kingdom's yahoo/news that "diplomats will no longer be sourced from the French

---

<sup>6</sup> [MACRON ANNOUNCES CLOSURE OF ENA, THE ELITE 'SCHOOL OF PRESIDENTS' THAT FRANCE LOVES TO HATE](#)

ministry for Foreign Affairs as is currently the case. Instead they will be hired from different backgrounds in both the public and private sectors.”<sup>7</sup>

## THE MEANING OF THE BRITISH OLIGARCHICAL PRINCIPLE



The oligarchical principle of the British Crown can be found in its motto, which comes from the Order of the Garter. It does not merely state that shame (HONI) shall befall to whomever thinks (PENSE) evil of the British oligarchy, but that the culprit will also be dishonored. The warning, therefore, insinuates the existence of a hidden offensive agenda, which threatens action against anyone who enters into disagreement with British interests, as they have demonstrated, for instance, in the case of Lyndon LaRouche.

Emblem of the Order of the Garter: SHAME ON HIM WHO THINKS ILL OF US

Instead of actually changing the *modus operandi* of the French government as per the plea of the Yellow Vests, Macron may have settled for the unspeakable shame of merely changing the name of the school and get away with it. Macron applied the arrogant British policy of a corrupt chivalry which says: “CONSIDER IT AN HONOR IF WE ARE SCREWING YOU AND SHAME ON HIM WHO SUSPECTS SOME ILLEGITIMATE MOTIVATION.” Remember that the British Royal motto was an arrogant statement of policy that Edward III, would be King of France, had made when he founded the “Order of the Garter” for the purpose of imposing English domination over France, on April 23, 1348. Historian Marten Kuilman wrote:

“According to historian Elias Ashmole, the foundation of the Garter occurred when King Edward III of England prepared for the Battle of Crécy and gave ‘forth his own garter as the signal.’ Another theory suggests ‘a

<sup>7</sup> [uk.news.yahoo.com](http://uk.news.yahoo.com) [Suppression of diplomatic corps could leave France without professional diplomats](#)

trivial mishap at a court function' when King Edward III was dancing with Joan of Kent, his first cousin and daughter-in-law. Her garter slipped down to her ankle causing those around her to snigger at her humiliation. In an act of chivalry, Edward placed the garter around his own leg saying, 'Honi soit qui mal y pense. Tel qui s'en rit aujourd'hui, s'honorera de la porter [demain].'

"The two phrases are often translated as follows: "A scoundrel, who thinks badly by it,' or "Shame on him who suspects illicit motivation.' followed by, 'Those who laugh at this today, tomorrow will be proud to wear it.' Other translations include: 'Spurned be the one who evil thinks', 'Shame be to him who thinks ill of it,' and 'Evil on him who thinks evil.'

"David Nash Ford observes that although

" 'Edward III may outwardly have professed the Order of the Garter to be a revival of the Round Table, it is probable that privately its formation was a move to gain support for his dubious claim to the French throne. The motto of the Order is a denunciation of those who think ill of some specific project, and not a mere invocation of evil upon evil-thinkers in general. 'Shame be to him who thinks ill of it' was probably directed against anyone who should oppose the King's design on the French Crown.' " <sup>8</sup>

However correct, British historian David Nash Ford may have been in this last statement, he was unhappy with such a humiliating "trivial mishap" and decided to look elsewhere for the origin of the motto. Meanwhile, when in doubt, always look for a way to discredit your enemy, so Ford blamed the French for this humiliation:

"This fable appears to have originated in France and was, perhaps, invented to bring discredit on the Order. There is a natural unwillingness to believe that the World's foremost Order of Chivalry had so frivolous a beginning, and we may more readily accept Froissart's account, who tells us:

---

<sup>8</sup>Marten Kuilman, [Honi soit qui mal y pense](#), DWDD Pop-Up Museum-Allard Pierson Museum, Amsterdam.

*"The King of England took pleasure to new re-edify the Castle of Windsor, the which was begun by King Arthur, and there first began the Table Round, whereby sprang the fame of so many noble knights throughout all the World. Then King Edward determined to make an Order and a Brotherhood ..... to be called Knights of the Blue Garter, and a feast to be kept yearly on St. George's Day."*<sup>9</sup>

The “fable” that Ford ostensibly attributed to a Frenchman is precisely the point at issue, which he missed. How subtly can a short “historical” account of blaming the French for the English motto reveal the truth of such an evil British policy principle? The question is: How to turn this “trivial mishap” into perceived British grandeur? The trick is all in the perception. Bertrand Russell identified precisely the matter: “How can you make people believe that snow is black?”

The full statement reported by French reporter, Inès Lombarteix, is the following: “Honi soit qui mal y pense. Ceux qui en rient maintenant, seront très honorés d’en porter un semblable car ce ruban sera mis en tel honneur que les railleurs eux-mêmes le chercheront avec empressement. »<sup>10</sup> (Shame on him who thinks ill of us. Those who laugh at us today will tomorrow be very happy to wear such a garter because it will represent such an honor that they will be seeking it with alacrity.) While on the one hand the young lady’s dignity was preserved, Edward III had another idea in mind: his purpose was to turn the humiliated moment into a noble action; that is, turn reality into fiction.

But then again, you might ask, is it not also quite a stretch to consider St George as the patron of the United Kingdom? St. George was not an Englishman (he was of South-West Asian extraction); he never killed a dragon, and although he fought in the Crusades, he never set foot in England either; and yet, every English boy since 1348 is made to believe him to be the glorious Patron Saint of British warfare. Why choose a warrior figure? How could the victory over the French, at the Battle of Crecy in 1346, become the oldest and highest honor in the British

---

<sup>9</sup> David Nash Ford, [The Order of the Garter](#) , Royal Berkshire History.

<sup>10</sup> Inès Lombarteix, [Pourquoi la devise de la monarchie britannique est-elle en français ?](#)



honor system? Now you can truly appreciate Percy Bysshe Shelley's poem on England in 1819:

“An old, mad, blind, despised, and dying King;  
Princes, the dregs of their dull race, who flow  
Through public scorn,—mud from a muddy spring;  
Rulers who neither see nor feel nor know,  
But leechlike to their fainting country cling  
Till they drop, blind in blood, without a blow.” —

### **THE TRUTH ABOUT THE BRITISH CHIVALRY CODE**

The British Royals are the watchdogs of the French elite. However, the key, here, is not to follow the elliptical curvature of Macron's career with respect to British oligarchism, but to figure out the evil behind the “chivalry code” which has been embraced by British and French leaders alike, since 1346.

The oligarchical notion of “chivalry” is not the image of the hero you are thinking about. This is not the romantic champion, who sacrifices himself for the benefit of the poor, the innocent, and the weak; a British Knight is a thug and a murderer. The British “chivalry code” has the purpose of educating mercenary warrior knights, who would be sent to kill and return to kill, as they are doing now in Ukraine as in many other countries, more and more, with total pleasure and resolve and without consideration of who their victims are. This is what Trans-Atlantic children are being trained to become today with the flow of video games on the market. Nineteenth century historian and political economist, Jean Charles Léonard de Sismondi, made the point about the chivalric phenomenon and its fake historicity. He wrote:

“It is always represented as distant from us both in time and place, and whilst the contemporary historians give us a clear, detailed, and complete account of the vices of the court and the great, of the ferocity or corruption of the nobles, and of the servility of the people, we are astonished to find the poets, after a long lapse of time, adorning the very same ages with the most splendid fictions of grace, virtue, and loyalty. The romance writers of the twelfth century placed the age of chivalry in the time of Charlemagne. The period when these writers existed, is the time pointed out by Francis I. At the present day [about 1810], we imagine we can still see chivalry flourishing in

the persons of Du Guesclin and Bayard, under Charles V and Francis I. But when we come to examine either the one period or the other, although we find in each some heroic spirits, we are forced to confess that it is necessary to antedate the age of chivalry, at least three or four centuries before any period of authentic history."<sup>11</sup>

If chivalry never existed, then what was its fictitious purpose? The purpose of super-hero chivalry is to cover up the evils of a corrupt oligarchical world. Historians are either ambivalent, or at best polite, on the fictitious character of chivalry as a social order. For instance, historian Richard W. Kaeuper reported "that in the problem of public order the knights themselves played an ambivalent, problematic role and that the guides to their conduct that chivalry provided were in themselves complex and problematic."<sup>12</sup> Kaeuper does not hesitate to identify the fact that the chivalry class saw no value in helping their fellow man with economic development and social improvement, because they considered labor as something that was beneath them. As Kaeuper put it, "those who engaged in commerce and derived their value system from it could be confronted with violence by knights, if need be."<sup>13</sup> Chivalry is nothing but the recruitment of mercenary armies hired by a failing oligarchy in its desperate attempt to survive. According to historian David Bruce Crouch, Knights were nothing but thugs:

"Historians and social anthropologists have documented the fact physical resilience and aptitude in warfare in the earliest formative period of 'proto-chivalry,' was, to contemporary warriors, almost essential of chivalry-defined knighthood (saving the implicit Christian-Davidic ethical framework) and for a warrior of any origin, even the lowliest, to demonstrate outstanding physicality-based prowess on the battlefield was seen as near certainty of noble-knightly status or grounds for immediate nobilitation. To

---

<sup>11</sup> Jean Charles Léonard de Sismondi, *Historical View of the Literatures of the South of Europe*. Translated by Thomas Roscoe (4th ed.). London.

<sup>12</sup> Richard W. Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence in Medieval Europe*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

<sup>13</sup> Richard W. Kaeuper, Op. Cit., pp. 121-139.

deliver a powerful blow in Arthurian literature almost always certifies of the warrior's nobility.”<sup>14</sup>

The idea of honor of the chivalry code is pure fiction; Knights were brutal killers, actual mercenaries.<sup>15</sup> What you are looking at in politics today is a variation on the Synarchist “beast-man” of Joseph de Maistre. Considering that globalization has entered into a period of deliberate destruction of the nation-state and of population reduction, the defense of the environment has become the new standard of belief and the basis for a new chivalric beast-man order. This may be the reason why a very astute Chinese analyst close to Xi Jinping, Wang Yiwei, wrote in the Chinese paper Huanqiu Shibao, that “sooner or later, a revolution in France is going to blow out, it is only a matter of time.”<sup>16</sup> The Chinese analyst based his conclusion on the fact that the traditional Republican and Socialist parties of France represented only 7% of the voting people while the extreme right obtained more than 30% of the votes in the first round. This French phenomenon is not a new fad and it will not disappear soon, this is an existential crisis which is about to blow up. The same is happening in all of the other western countries as well. Are you going to be a victim of this new scourge?

### **SOLIDARITE & PROGRES : PRESIDENT JACQUES CHEMINADE ISSUES STATEMENT ON FRENCH ELECTIONS**

PARIS, April 25, 2022 (EIRNS)—This presidential campaign has completely neglected the concerns of the French people and the challenges of the world. Our ruling classes are not motivated by the general interest, because they believe they are the sole holders of the legitimate power that they have captured by breaking and entering, as accustomed, or, within the party system, by family or administrative inheritance. They have thus rendered themselves blind and powerless.

---

<sup>14</sup> David Bruce Crouch, (2005). *The Birth of Nobility: Constructing Aristocracy in England and France 900–1300*. Harlow, UK: Pearson.

<sup>15</sup> See Terry Jones, *Chaucer's Knight: The Portrait of a Medieval Mercenary*. Methuen Paperback, 1985.

<sup>16</sup> [Diaboliser le peuple, dernière carte des élites « abâtardies »](#), Solidarité & Progrès, Friday, April 29, 2022. [Vu de Chine. À l'issue de la présidentielle, “une révolution se prépare en France.”](#)



‘Let us not leave France in the hands of bankers.’ Solidarité & Progrès

Food, housing, lighting, heating, and transportation to work: everything has become too expensive in France. In the world, a France that is subservient to NATO and unable to assert its assets is no longer respected.

- While we are in an emergency at least equivalent to war,
- while an economic dislocation is threatening and an unprecedented technological mutation is taking place,
- while a popular will for change, recovery and social justice is being expressed,

Nobody on our official political scene has elaborated a coherent alternative.

It is with this will, electorally dispersed, that Solidarité & Progrès is listening, trying to give it a face. To give back confidence, hope and enthusiasm to the sovereignty of the people, in order to establish a political project at the level of the world drama that we are going to undergo. Without exclusivity, with [the party of Georges Kuzmanovic] Sovereign Republic, we present candidates to the legislative

elections to form an embryo of union and popular bloc, beyond the dispersion that blunt ideologies and personal ambitions have generated.

With the spirit of Jean Jaurès, Charles de Gaulle and the Preamble of our Constitution, so far misused, we fight the financial oligarchy and its military-industrial complex which is our real enemy, not this or that party or this or that nation, however misguided.

France needs explorers who, faced with the threats and uncertainties of the present, see with the eyes of the future.

To raise to the dignity of man all the individuals of the human species is our ambition. Let us rediscover, by taking up the challenge, this enthusiasm which is love of the beautiful, the true and the good. (“Après le 24 avril: Donner un visage au bloc populaire,” <https://jacquescheminade.fr/Apres-le-24-avril-donner-un-visage-au-bloc-populaire>)

This new face of Solidarité & Progrès that Cheminade is showing is that of the process of economic self-development, the self-generating function of the creative process of the people, by the people, and for the people. That is also what Dennis Speed recently expressed by emphasizing the matter of principle as the process of creativity to be waged against the NATO-Global-Britain project:

“NATO is to be the expression of that ‘Global Britain’ for which the Americans are to perform the role of Persia to Britain’s Babylon. People like British Select Defense Committee chairman Tobias Ellwood condescendingly declare themselves the ‘vanguard’ that can go it alone in order to force the Americans to follow their lead. The British are prepared to mobilize the last American ‘zombie’ dollar for depopulation. Monetarism is their religion. People don’t matter, only the Empire. That is the religious content, the ‘spiritual organizing principle’ of the present Crusade of the ‘Anglosphere,’ ‘Oceania,’ ‘Global Britain,’ or what is best called ‘perfidious Albion.’”<sup>17</sup>

FIN

---

<sup>17</sup> [Morning Briefing](#) for Saturday, April 30, 2022.