

If You Can't Fight on Horseback, Continue on Foot

By J.K. Baltzersen

J.K. Baltzersen has interviewed His Imperial and Royal Highness Dr. [Otto von Habsburg](#), Archduke of Austria and head of the [House of Habsburg](#), which ruled varying parts of [Christendom](#) for several centuries. His Highness was Member of the [European Parliament](#) for 20 years. The Archduke saw his youngest daughter, [Countess Walburga Douglas](#), elected to the Swedish Parliament, the [Riksdag](#), last fall. Dr. Otto von Habsburg was this spring in the [media](#) in connection with the 50th anniversary of the [Treaty of Rome](#). His Highness was named number 8 among the top people of 2006 by [Inside the Vatican](#). The Archduke is the author of some 30 books, including [The Social Order of Tomorrow](#), and has given a number of speeches, including [The Mises I Knew](#). Dr. Otto von Habsburg has been a member of the [Mont Pelerin Society](#). Among the biographies is Gordon Brook-Shepherd's [Uncrowned Emperor](#).

Q: Did the Archduke meet any Norwegian royals in North America during WWII?

A: Yes, I met the Crown Princess of Norway several times. She was, as you know, a very influential person, who did a tremendous job for her country. I met her with President Roosevelt. The Crown Princess was a person who had made a lot of headway on ideas during the war. She had a great influence in the United States. And consequently she was discussing all these matters. I was, however, of course more concerned with Austria, Hungary, and the countries of Southern Central Europe.

Q: How does the Archduke see the euro in relation to the concept of government controlled money?

A: I am rather for control of money than I was at a time. That is so. I have now seen especially the experiences of the countries of Central Europe. The formula of the European Union is not bad. It can of course be improved. That is quite clear. But I think it has a major role today especially since we are in a situation of international inflation. Let's go back to the end of World War II. The United States opened the gates for inflation with the decision of the paper gold. I was at the time very much against that sort of approach. I think we now are starting to pay for it.

Q: Is the introduction of the euro progress or decline?

A: The euro is definitely progress. For one reason: What is the great success of the United States economy? It is that you have the same currency from one sea to the next. Consequently, there is a certain inner stability. Of course, this inner stability has some disadvantages, because it makes people too much ill-assured. My voters were concerned with trade with Italy, and the graph of the rate between the German mark and the Italian lira looked like the Russian coast line, it was not straight. You could plan for at most 4 weeks when doing trade with Italy. It would be preferable to be able to plan 2 to 3 years ahead. I was very much convinced that the most important thing was monetary stability. The more we could extend the area of stability, the better.

Q: Did the Archduke have any discussions with Ludwig von Mises or other members of the Mont Pelerin Society on capitalism vs. third-way alternatives?

A: Certainly. I had quite a number. Not only with Mises, but also with Hayek. He was one of my best friends there. I also had such conversations with others, such as French and Italian members. At one time I was very active in the Mont Pelerin Society, but then I dropped out, because as a parliamentarian I wasn't so free to talk. I hadn't the time anymore. I concentrated my efforts on enlargement and the security which enlargement gives.

Q: What are Your Highness's reflections on capitalism vs. third-way alternatives?

A: I am primarily for anything that gives the economy freedom. If we let the bureaucrats rule, the situation in the economy will be a very unhappy situation. That is one of the great problems for us in the future too. So I would say that capitalism is a good system. On one condition; it should know its limits. If it goes beyond its limits, it can become dangerous for itself, and that's very dangerous indeed.

Q: What are Your Highness's reflections on the future of European culture?

A: We have to keep to our culture, especially to the philosophical background of our culture, which is after all a religious background. That is one thing on which I had differences with several of my friends of the Mont Pelerin Society. They went a little bit too far with their approach. I think that in general, if Europe sticks to its culture, if Europe continues to follow that road, and I think we have a good chance to do so, it will be a major feature of stability.

Q: What is the future of the European social model?

His Highness: Do you mean the concept that the politicians are talking about?

Baltzersen: Yes, referred to by politicians as the basis for high tax levels.

A: That, of course, I do not favor. I think that it's running out. We are getting more and more into trouble, and therefore I cannot be in favor of something that, in the end – while it gives certain groups in our society advantages – will lead us into something most unpleasant.

Q: In *The Social Order of Tomorrow* the Archduke proposed suffrage for all born exercised until majority by the family provider. Is this still relevant? Does the Archduke see any way this would influence the welfare state? Would this not increase the demand for welfare benefits to children and young families?

A: I do believe that the problem of the political rights of the families, the right to vote of children would have certainly not had in my opinion anything to do with the welfare state. It is a question of survival and of defense of families. We must realize that Europe is a dying continent and that today the problem is how to keep it alive.

Q: What are the Archduke's memories of Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn?

A: With Kuehnelt-Leddihn I had a lot of contacts. I knew Kuehnelt-Leddihn from the beginning to his death. I saw him a few weeks before his death in Tyrol. He was already very sick. I had to do with him when he was still a young man. He was certainly a brilliant brain, a

person of a tremendous knowledge, and of great courage, because he was taking some chances with his sometimes very precise points of view. He was successful because he had a great influence by the tremendous width of this knowledge, and by his personal courage.

Q: What are the Archduke's opinions on his theories on monarchy and democracy?

A: My personal opinion is this: This is always a wrong kind of comparison, because there is a possibility of democracy in a monarchy, and there are, alas, examples with monarchies – Italy was an example with Mussolini – where there is no democracy. So we have to separate these two ideas very clearly. Monarchy vs. republic and democracy vs. the different other political forms. This sort of monarchy vs. democracy comparison is simply unjustified. It compares two things that are on a different level – and of different task. Monarchy or republic is the question of the form of state. Democracy can't be something inside the state for the achievement of certain goals. One has to be very careful with the use of words in this situation.

Q: What is Your Highness's view on the modern concept of absolute democracy?

A: Absolute in politics is always bad. That is absolutely clear. To speak of absolute democracy, especially in the United States, they extend this notion of democracy beyond what the real aim of democracy is. Democracy is a form of political life and political decision-making. Personally, I am very worried about the future of democracy. We are going further away, because democracy is losing its lively touch with the soil. It is being elevated to something which it is not. Let's have a look at electoral law. Electoral law is in many instances unable to give us a future. That is true for the election system with strict lists of candidates. I have spent twenty years in that system, and I know it is bad. It is bad because the main thing with democracy is a close touch between the voters and the people they elect. We are moving in a broad way away from that concept. We are moving away from it because most parliamentarians today are chosen by a machine. The people have very little to do with it now. One still talks of democracy, but what we really have is "inpartytocracy", which is something entirely different from democracy. The party machine is taking over. Let's consider those countries where we have the list system. I will not be indiscreet to name the country, but we have for instance here in Europe a country where the list of candidates – the rigid list – is approved by eight persons in that country. If that's democracy, then I don't like it. Personally, I am absolutely convinced that democracy is only possible with direct elections, the politicians not being appointed by party bureaucrats. There should be a direct touch between the elected and the voters. I have been trying for twenty years – not always with success, alas – to have this continued lively touch with the people. By maintaining this contact you learn the thinking of the people. Take Germany, take Austria, take many other countries, there is no longer any touch with the voter. I am not very popular with the party machine. Still I am convinced that having this touch is the right thing.

In 1946 in France there was a financial scandal. The scandal was a great turning point in French domestic affairs. The population was at the time much shocked by corruption in higher places. It is no longer the case. They have been getting gradually accustomed to this. At that time there was a tremendous disturbance in Paris. I was by chance in Paris. I was interested in the case. I went to a parliamentary session, which was a very stormy one. After a while I went out, and there was a rebellion at the Place de la Concorde, which was across the Seine. Blood was being shed. A group of old soldiers and so on wanted to storm the Parliament. On one side there was a group of furious people. On the other side a police who tried to contain them.

I started to walk across the bridge, and behind me came a Member of Parliament. I didn't know who he was. He was obviously a man of extreme courage, because he felt what was in the air. I came about halfway across the bridge, and at that moment somebody recognized the Member of Parliament, and he shouted to the crowd "you see that's one of those scoundrels," whereupon the crowd immediately tried to throw him into the Seine, which would have been a deadly thing, because it was in the middle of the winter. At that time a big man with a beard came out from behind me and shouted "this man you don't touch, he is my member." And so the people left him. I would like to see the parliament today with someone shouting "he is my member." Today, they don't know whom they've elected.

Q: The Blessed Emperor Karl said that ruling democratically was a worse error than ruling autocratically. What are Your Highness's comments to this?

A: It depends on the situation. You can't be too doctrinaire on that, because there are sometimes and some very grave situations where a certain show of authority is necessary, but in general I would say that it is better to rule democratically. However, it is always on the condition that democracy must really be the representation of the people, and not the corporate organization for bureaucratic rule.

Q: What is worse; "the strong man," almighty bureaucrats and parliaments, or the tyranny of the majority? What is the greater danger?

A: That is something where you really can't be too doctrinaire, but I would be rather convinced that I don't like strong people. I have lived through too many strong people through my whole political career. It was Hitler and Stalin, and therefore I still believe that any form that puts some brake on power is preferable.

Q: What is it that gives pervasive government today compared to the pre-1914 order?

A: I am speaking of Central Europe especially. Before it was more decentralized. The municipalities had more power than they have now. The single communities were more influential. The power could not reach into every house, contrary to the fact of today's life. The system in Austria and Hungary before 1914 was preferable because of this situation of limited power.

Q: How do we bring these desirable elements of the pre-1914 order back? Does the Archduke have any advice for those who look back at the pre-1914 order with envy?

A: I am of course not very much interested in basing policy on nostalgia.

Q: Does the Archduke have any reflections on the "Friday Club" vs. Montesquieu's warnings against over-worked or perpetual parliaments?

A: My experience in the European Parliament is that the "Friday Club" was a very good institution, because on Friday's agenda there were always those matters with interest not in the system itself. You had the freedom to study the matters and deciding without reference to party affiliation. What I enjoyed with the "Friday Club" – and God knows I was a complete member of the "Friday Club" – was one thing. I would study before the plenary session. I would pick from the order of the day, as it was prepared, a matter that I would deal with. We were always the same group of people discussing these matters. We were fairly independent.

Party control was no longer there, because they weren't interested in these matters. They had greater matters to deal with.

Personally, I learnt a lot from that "Friday Club," because it forced me very often to look after something I didn't know anything about, and that was very useful – if you wanted to do it seriously.

It collapsed after I left. Most of the people who supported it left at the same time. I still think it's a loss. First, you were connected with the small problems of the people. One should not forget that Parliament also has a responsibility for individual problems, towards small problems.

The whole idea of Friday sessions was started by a colleague we had in the first electoral period of the European Parliament. He was a black French representative from La Martinique. He was from the Liberal group. For some reason he had an unlimited confidence in me. So whenever he had a problem he would come and discuss it with me. He once brought a problem for La Martinique regarding export of some fruit to me. A proposal had already passed the committees. He made it clear to me that what the bureaucrats had proposed was absurd. It would hurt a group of perhaps a thousand black families. I got into the matter. I talked with the head of the trade unionists. He was in the committee which had passed the proposal. I explained the whole problem to him. He understood. So we started to act. We finally broke the matter, although it had already passed the committees. This sort of things that slow down the action, that go to the details, but without party consideration, was a very healthy thing we had in this "Friday Club." I am very sorry that it disappeared because from that time on many things could pass without that sort of control.

In the Parliament there were these forty members who had all sorts of party affiliations, but we discussed the matters. We had this feeling that we were responsible.

There is this true story of Emperor Franz Josef. Theodore Roosevelt made a trip around the world. On this trip he also went to Austria and visited Emperor Franz Josef. This is in the memoirs of Theodore Roosevelt. He asked the Emperor what a monarch could still do in modern democratic systems, whereupon the old Emperor told him: "Well, my task is to protect my peoples from their governments." Now we have few monarchies. Parliaments could still have this possibility of being exactly the element that protects the people from their government, and that is one thing that we don't have anymore under this sort of almost semi-authoritarian parliamentarism, which we have at least in Europe. The Americans are better off from that point of view right now, because they still have a personal election. They don't have proportional representation. But nowadays we are working fully into that area, and that's going to lead us to a very serious crisis of democracy.

Q: Would the Blessed Emperor Karl's federalization have been contrary to Emperor Franz Josef's concept of protecting his peoples from their governments?

A: No, on the contrary. They would have been complementary. My father would have felt that way. If we had maintained the right kind of parliament, the cooperation between the monarch and parliament would have been very good.

Q: What was the Archduke taught on those walks on Madeira?

A: They were the only opportunity of a very few days when my father could be with us. He liked very much walking and since we two, the elder ones, Adelheid and myself could go with him and that is when he talked very friendly with us. Frank talks were even rare in the house because of the way we were under surveillance.

Q: What are the Archduke's opinions on the Britons who want to dissociate themselves from the EU and the EPP?

A: I hope they won't do it. I am utterly convinced that it will be a mistake if they do it, but I am not British. I am not a member of the British Parliament. I am not even of the European Parliament now, where I always had very close friendships with the British Conservatives. I see that those that were of my thinking are now practically out.

Q: Is there a conflict between the EU and monarchy, save the figurehead kind? Some would say the European Union is almost the contrary of the pre-1914 order. For instance, there were some fierce reactions to the referendum in Liechtenstein which gave the Prince more powers. It could seem that the European Union would never tolerate a monarchy such as the Liechtenstein one.

A: Concerning Monarchy and the European Union there would be only a conflict if the European Union went beyond the borders of its rights within the Union. It would be a tremendous error if the Union was thinking of imposing a solution of the form of state on its members whether it be republic or monarchy. This also applies to Liechtenstein whose constitution would certainly be considered within the limits of democratic principles. It is my opinion that in any case the European Union in order to be able to operate effectively should strictly limit its interventions on the rights it has. It should not be a centralized organization.

Q: What are the Archduke's thoughts on the EU Constitution?

A: I was for and against the Constitution. On principle I am not against the Constitution. The Constitution must be brief and clear and contain only principles. Empress Maria Theresa one day said very wisely: "a law, in order to be legitimate, must be so clear that the last shepherd of Galicia can understand it well." You know perfectly well that today even scientists don't understand what is in our legislation in general. That book of that thickness, which I saw in the campaign for the European Constitution, was an appalling thing. In principal the ideas of Giscard d'Estaing were alright, but what happened was that our beloved governments stepped in and created a committee of 106 persons on how to finalize the text. You know perfectly well that if food is cooked by 106 cooks, it is not edible, and that's exactly what we have. It's too long. It is the second longest judiciary text in the world, the longest being of South Korea. I am not very much in favor of that. But I defended it, for one reason. During the French referendum I made some public speeches, saying to the people that the Constitution is bad, but I beg you to vote for it, because if you don't accept it, it would be a deep reaction against Europe as such as a notion, but I also beg of you the next day after the voting has taken place you take on the action to change it. I think it was a tragedy that the idea of a European Constitution was not won.

It shouldn't be more than three pages. What is a constitution? We have today two possible constitutional elements in the European Union. Each one of them could be expressed with

very short text. The first is the social market idea, which stems from the Treaty of Rome. The other is subsidiarity, which came with Maastricht. I think that subsidiarity is one of the most important points, because it excludes from the whole thing greater entities which take over things that the smaller entities would carry out in a satisfactory manner. When you are working in Parliament, and taking it seriously, you will always have the feeling that a law must be short, clear, it could be to judicial judgment, but it should not be too much into detail, because that takes away the essential flexibility which you need. Therefore I think that a European Constitution of two pages could be excellent, if it's rightly thought. If it goes above two pages – maximum three – it will be a catastrophe.

Q: Is the subsidiarity principle from the Maastricht Treaty more than words on paper?

A: Alas, at present no, because the bureaucratic interests that run the European Union are of course against it. Their control ceases if the principle of subsidiarity is carried out in the way I like it.

Q: There are people who view the European Union as a project for centralization. What is Your Highness's view on this?

A: I am not enthusiastic about that sort of centralization, which is entailed in certain formulas.

Q: Is it a reasonable position to see the Archduke's enthusiasm for the European Union in the light of the Blessed Emperor Karl's wish for his peoples to come together again?

A: Of course, the European Union and its extension are just as logical as was Emperor Charles will to keep its peoples as much as possible together. The main point is that extension of the Union is a pre-condition of European security.

Q: What are the Archduke's memories of Ludwig von Mises advising on Habsburg restoration?

A: He was a great man. He was a man who was for freedom, and I think he was a man who had this sort of inner independence that permitted him to say things that he was thinking, which other people don't.

Q: Does Your Highness have any memories of concrete advice given to Your Highness for a Habsburg restoration from Ludwig von Mises?

A: No. We were talking of other things. My main contacts were at the time when this was a very remote subject. It was a topic of principle, but after 1938 the matter was postponed for a very simple reason; a possible monarchy was conceivable, but could only be realized after the defeat of Nazism. And consequently I personally was defending the opinion "let's not discuss it now" for one reason; "let's first unite to finish totalitarianism. President Roosevelt asked me one day what my opinion was on the subject of a possible monarchy restoration in Austria at the end of the war, and I said to him very frankly "my personal juridical opinion is that you cannot decide a domestic issue of a nation as long as it is under foreign and totalitarian occupation. As soon as you regain sovereignty you can start to discuss it again. As long as a country has no sovereignty, and the discussion is a discussion among foreign powers, that's not correct.

Q: In Your Highness's opinion what is the reason for the decline of monarchist sentiment in Central Europe after World War II?

A: I wouldn't say it did decline. Of course, there is the outward sign that would say there is a decline. This is because, generally speaking, international influence is opposed to monarchy, which is an error and their own thing. Also, the matter has not been discussed sufficiently. Take my own problem. My own problem is this that during and after the war the issue was the reestablishment of freedom and sovereignty of the different countries. If we started out to discuss matters that were not of our competence, that would indeed create a major difficulty for a future solution. And that's why I also put a brake on this.

I could have been very close to it in Hungary. They wanted me to be President, and that would have meant something. I did not want to stand for this, because I realized that it wouldn't be to the advantage of the country at that time – with the Russians still close to our borders and so on. You have to put in priorities in your own mind, and that, of course, means that certain problems cannot be raised.

But take for instance the case of Bulgaria – King Simeon. When his moment came, he had of course against him the whole international opinion.

Q: What about this view that if a non-reigning royal engages in partisan politics, this is in conflict with being a future monarch?

A: I wouldn't say so. Absolutely not. Members of former dynasties have also their obligations, and if you can't win a battle on horseback, jump down and continue on foot.

Q: Could one say that it is a Habsburg call to serve their peoples, and if the times do not permit them to do so from thrones, they must do so in the institutions through which they are allowed to do so?

A: It is logical for a Habsburg to be in politics. After all the family has been in politics for 600 years, and it would be strange if they stayed out of it with all the heritage they have. I am of course also of the opinion that if a Habsburg has the feeling that he has to serve his people he would have to do so because that would be not a right but an obligation

Q: Does the Archduke have any reflections on the future of monarchy in Europe, and in Scandinavia in particular?

A: Well, in Scandinavia as long as you have it, keep it for God's sake. It's a good system. It is a good brake. It has generally been very successful in preserving the democratic system. But it is a matter which can be discussed, and it should be discussed, because it is an interesting subject. After all the people are not there for the state, the state is there for the people. We always have to think in these terms.

Q: What about the figurehead type of monarchy vs. a monarchy with a more active monarch?

A: In any case, the figurehead type has a great advantage. We have seen that in many crises the figurehead is something very valuable in very difficult times. Therefore I personally think it would be a good thing, but let's see how it can be carried out or not.

Q: What is Your Highness's opinion on the very emasculated Swedish monarchy, where the monarch has all but no constitutional role?

A: But he has still a tremendous moral possibility of giving some lines. So I would say it still would be a very good system, better certainly than some others.

Q: The Archduke has previously – from what I understand – held a not so high opinion of the late Duke of Windsor. What is the Archduke's opinion of European marriages so far this century?

A: You are right, I have the opinion that a ruler who accepts his tasks has not a right to turn his back on the task for purely personal interests.

Q: What role is there for the House of Habsburg to play in the future?

A: Well, I don't know. I'm not a prophet. But I know something. You have a feeling of obligation. I'm taking again my own example. There are certain things that are paramount for me. First of all a brake; protection against exaggerating oneself, because when people cheer me and so on, I always say "do they cheer me or do they cheer my ancestors in me?" One does not go to this exaggerated self-evaluation. Secondly, that there is such a thing as a deep responsibility for one's own nation, and you have to carry it out regardless of what you are doing at present or of what you can obtain.

I have had certain situations. For instance – again Hungary – when the turn came, after the events of Sopron, which we had organized, there was a time when everybody asked me to be a candidate for the presidency, and at that time I said no, and for a very simple reason. I had been twenty years in the European Parliament. I knew that the European Parliament would have a major influence for all of Central Europe after the wall was over. I was the only one who spoke Hungarian at the European Parliament. After I talked with several people before I made my definite decision, I said "I could do more under the present conditions by not doing what they wanted me to do. It interested me. I say that frankly, because historically it would have been a sort of novel. But I thought I could do more by staying in Parliament than by accepting this demand that I should be the President. Now looking at it retrospectively it was the right decision, because very probably I wouldn't have been able to do what I did without a certain influence in Parliament, i.e., influence with the governments through Parliament. My position permitted a great deal to be put through, which I, as either President of the Republic or Head of State, I wouldn't have been able to. That's my personal attitude.

Q: Does the Archduke have any regrets about the [renunciation] declaration of 1961?

A: No. I have no regrets, because I thought it was the right thing which I did. I wasn't happy about it, but frankly for me, always thinking what my ancestors would do, always thinking of the tremendous responsibility one has for one's actions before God and before the compatriots, especially compatriots who have suffered very much, you have to make your choice.

Q: How is this declaration to be interpreted?

A: As a matter coming from a given political condition, where I didn't see any other way to achieve what was my main task.

Q: How is the declaration of November 11, 1918 on renunciation of power to be interpreted?

A: The winning powers, very much at the initiative of Great Britain, had declared that they would not negotiate the lifting of the food blockade for the population of Austria and Hungary while the Emperor, my father, was there. What can you do?

Q: The historian Alan Sked was quite harsh on the Blessed Emperor Karl in his [*The Decline and Fall of the Habsburg Empire, 1815-1918*](#). Dr. Sked claims war to have been a Habsburg habit, and he attacks the last Emperor for not even thanking the soldiers when leaving his throne. What is the Archduke's response to this?

A: NONSENSE!!!

Q: Could the old European order have survived if events had turned differently in the years 1914-1918?

A: Yes. There were my father's proposals and the proposals of Pope Benedict XV for peace negotiations. My uncle, Prince Sixtus de Bourbon of France and – less discussed – General Smuts of South Africa on the other side must also be mentioned. If this had been successful, there would have been a solution which would have meant peace even at that time. But they didn't want to.

Q: Could the Romanov regime have survived?

A: I don't know so much the details, but I rather doubt it, because the social tensions in Russia were much greater than they were elsewhere. I don't know. This is one of those difficult questions to which in the end you cannot give a definite answer with conscience.

Q: There are people in Austria who say "Otto ist der österreichischer Kaiser [is the Austrian Emperor]." What is Your Highness's attitude towards these people?

A: Well, I understand what they feel. It's their privilege to say what they think. And that's that.

Q: When one travels in Austria, one often gets an impression quite contrary to Austria being a republic. Does the Archduke have any comments to this fact?

A: A country that has been a monarchy, such as France, has still a lot of heritage kept, as it is logical that a country that has a sense of history also keeps certain memories of the past, which are the basis upon which the future is built.

Q: There are some people who connect Nazism with old order monarchy. How can this be?

A: Well, that is absurd in a land of absurdity, because really Nazism was not all that. Nazism was a consequence of the Peace Treaty at the end of World War I, and that was not the old order. It was the end of the old order that brought it about.

Q: The Archduke in *The Social Order of Tomorrow* said that the old order was gone and that no new order had emerged. Are we still in this state?

A: Most countries get ruined if they stop the time and the evolution which time brings.

Q: The signature of Your Highness might to some look like Franz Josef, the first two names in the full Christian name of Your Highness. Is this so?

A: No. It isn't like it. It's not very like it. It's much bigger. It's much harder. And it doesn't even have the same kind of lines. I have often been asked what it meant. For instance, only a short while ago a little of these extremist publications said that finally they gotten to know that by my signature I showed what my real orientation was, because in my signature there are two triangles, which I didn't even realize up until that moment. So they said that this is a Masonic sign. It's not. I can assure you that. I never try to imitate them. Certain adaptations of my signature were done because I had to do so many autographs, that I preferred to do it in the fastest possible way of writing. I was very pragmatic.

Q: In the Stadtmuseum in Hall, Tyrol a couple of years ago there was a letter exhibited from Your Highness to Sebastian Rieger with the expression "die Kaiserin und ich [the Empress and I]." Would "die Kaiserin" refer to Empress Zita or Archduchess Regina?

A: Empress Zita. She was a Kaiserin. Let's not forget.

Q: Has the Archduke often returned to Monte in Madeira [where the Blessed Emperor Karl passed on] or other sites of exile?

A: I have been several times for religious ceremonies that were connected with the beatification of my father.

Q: Has the Archduke been to the Habsburg castle in Switzerland?

A: The Habsburg Castle in Switzerland is a historical very interesting place although I have rarely had the opportunity of going there.



Q: There is a joke running about the Archduke commenting on an empty meeting room [in the European Parliament], a sports game, and Austria-Hungary [after allegedly being told that the game was played by Austria and Hungary, the Archduke allegedly asked who the opponent was]. Did the Archduke really do this joke or is it a made up joke?

A: Si non e vero, e ben trovato.

Baltzersen: I thank Your Imperial and Royal Highness for the time, knowledge, and opinions.

J.K. Baltzersen writes from Oslo, the capital of the Oil Kingdom of Norway. You are cordially invited to his blog [Wilson Revolution Unplugged](#).