

Queen Elizabeth risks all for New Yalta deal with Moscow

by Criton Zoakos

Following British Foreign Secretary Sir Geoffrey Howe's meeting with South African President P. W. Botha on July 30, the chances for Queen Elizabeth's abdication stood at "fifty-fifty," according to estimates of intelligence circles monitoring the unfolding confrontation between Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and the British Royal Family.

However, the magnitude of the risk that the British Royal Family decided to take, when it plunged into an open constitutional confrontation with the prime minister over the convenient issue of economic sanctions against South Africa, is not greater than the strategic stakes over which the fight is actually being waged.

Queen Elizabeth II and the House of Windsor are committed to a world strategic deal with the present leadership in Moscow for redrawing the political map of the world according to precepts which Lord Carrington, the present general secretary of NATO, has dubbed "The New Yalta Deal." Prior to Lord Carrington's espousal of this perspective, this scheme was advanced by Lord Mountbatten, who, in addition to being the Queen's confidant, was, until his timely death, the principal mentor of Prince Charles, who one day is supposed to succeed the Queen. The New Yalta Deal, in broad outline, was described by the late Yuri Andropov in an April 1983 interview in the weekly *Der Spiegel*, with fascinating simplicity: The United States should abandon all its interests and claims of influence throughout the "Eurasian landmass," a term denoting the continents of Europe, Asia, Africa, and Oceania, in return for which, the new Russian Empire would allow the United States to maintain a certain influence in the "Western Hemisphere."

From the standpoint of Britain's ruling House of Windsor, the "Eurasian landmass" sans American influence would be shared, condominium style, by two power-elites, the Muscovite Third Rome devotees, and the House of Windsor and its allies. The latter, according to their reckoning, would

include in their ranks all 49 members of the British Commonwealth, including India, Australia, Canada, and Africa's Commonwealth members, as well as those Western European countries in which the various branches of the Windsor-related Saxe-Coburg-Gotha clans of oligarchs do or could dominate in terms of policy.

Such a Windsor-led coalition, in Queen Elizabeth's reckoning, would be able to share a "Eurasian" condominium with the Muscovite-centered coalition of the U.S.S.R., Warsaw Pact, and kindred allies, and would eventually, in the long run, prevail.

Whatever speculative elements one might wish to add to this strategic perspective, its "bottom line" is that Moscow and Buckingham Palace are in a strategic alliance to reduce the influence of the United States in the world to "approximately 25% of its postwar extent," in the words of Henry Kissinger. Margaret Thatcher and the issue of South Africa suddenly acquire a uniqueness and a timely prominence only when viewed from the perspective of this imminent Buckingham-Kremlin condominium: Thatcher, in the Queen's view, is "too much pro-American." And South Africa, with its unique combination of internal problems and international economic-strategic importance, is perhaps the best available trigger to cause a sudden collapse of U.S. power. The Queen's scenario works as follows:

'The Crash of 1986'

There is no issue of "apartheid" in the Republic of South Africa other than that created by the British colonial administration of that country. Increasingly since South Africa declared itself the Republic of South Africa and broke out of the British Commonwealth, that nation's commitment to wipe out the British Empire's racist legacy has been thwarted more by the machinations of Her Majesty's Commonwealth and their Soviet imperial allies than by the relics of segrega-

tionist habits in the domestic population. The present government of President Botha is thwarted from fully realizing its anti-apartheid program only by the bloodthirsty agitation of the Communist-led and Communist-controlled "African National Congress."

Queen Elizabeth's demand—as presented by Sir Geoffrey Howe to President Botha at the end of July—is *not* to "end apartheid," as the lying popular press reports, but, specifically, to go into a "power-sharing" deal with the Communist-dominated African National Congress. The Queen and the House of Windsor, through its direct and indirect influences

English-speaking world, have instigated the present call for "economic sanctions" in favor of bringing the Communist-dominated ANC to power.

As the threat of economic sanctions grew, the government of the Republic of South Africa, gradually over time, developed its own strategy of countering it. By this spring, Pretoria made it known to its major trading partners, that it was fully prepared to answer economic warfare with economic warfare: total embargo of strategic raw materials upon which the entire West depends, and financial warfare in the form of not only repudiation of South Africa's \$24 billion in foreign debt, but instigation of a wave of debt repudiations throughout the developing sector of the world economy.

The means which South Africa possesses for retaliation were assessed, in great detail, both in London and Switzerland during the late spring and early summer of this year. Both drew the conclusion that the indubitable outcome of economic warfare with South Africa would be a worldwide financial collapse of a magnitude and devastation far greater than experienced—or imagined—in the last Great Depression.

Prime Minister Thatcher's present opposition to the sanctions policy, and also the opposition from Japan, the United States, and the Federal Republic of Germany, is based on a general understanding that sanctions are most likely to bring about a worldwide collapse of the present financial system. London and Swiss banking and other financial institutions have extricated themselves from positions of financial vulnerability and believe themselves to be relatively invulnerable to the effects of such a collapse. The collapse, London and Switzerland believe, will be the collapse of the world's *U.S. dollar-based system*, and American financial institutions.

The reason for which President Reagan, Prime Minister Thatcher, and their German and Japanese counterparts are opposed to the policy of punitive sanctions against South Africa, is the same reason for which Queen Elizabeth and the House of Windsor support it: the collapse of the U.S. financial system, and with it, the collapse of the United States as a world power. The Windsors' Elizabeth is accepting the risk of a constitutional blowout of the United Kingdom only because she expects her reward to be the *de facto* establishment of a Eurasian condominium with the Kremlin.

On July 20, the Palace launched a series of premeditated "leaks," presenting to the astonished British public an image of the Queen, acting unconstitutionally, expressing bitter political disagreements with her prime minister. There was the sanctions issue, but other disagreements were expressed: Thatcher's cooperation with President Reagan against Qaddafi, and Thatcher's conservative domestic policies. The Queen's official spokesman said that "the Queen is very much to the Left on social issues," and "the Queen is not a member of the right-wing establishment."

After the initial public astonishment, a wave of invective against the Monarchy's unconstitutional intervention flooded Britain. The prime minister remained composed and silent, but the Palace repeated its provocations in the form of a letter of the Queen's private secretary, Sir William Heseltine. All of a sudden, the prime minister found herself surrounded with the unqualified support of the majority of the country's political leadership, industry leadership, the people, and most of the press.

Following Sir Geoffrey Howe's failed visit to Pretoria, Mrs. Thatcher called a cabinet meeting from which she extracted a unanimous vote of support for her policy of opposing sanctions. The word in London was that so long as President Reagan opposes sanctions, Prime Minister Thatcher will continue to oppose the Queen on this matter. The Palace, probably stung by what must have been an unanticipated epidemic of long-dormant republican virtue on the British isles, made an adjustment in its offensive: Since Thatcher relies on President Reagan's position, let's break President Reagan.

As a result, amid an outbreak of uncharacteristically passionate demagoguery and irrationality, the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate sent to the floor a bill calling for extensive economic sanctions against South Africa. As of this writing, a large-scale, bipartisan effort, led by Sen. Ted Kennedy (D-Mass.) for the Democrats and Sen. Richard Lugar (R-Ind.) for the Republicans, is under way to secure passage of this ignominious bill by a two-thirds majority, to pre-empt President Reagan's anticipated veto. Every little boy and girl in the U.S. Senate who, like Senator Lugar and Sen. Daniel Moynihan (D-N.Y.), once had a Cecil Rhodes scholarship, is now mobilized to return the favor to the Queen. None of the loud-mouthed senators demanding sanctions can cite any constituency or national interest which would justify this policy. None has responded to both President Reagan's and Chief Buthelezi's argument that sanctions would cause untold suffering of black South Africans, or their appeal for a Marshall Plan for South Africa. Like good Cecil Rhodes racist colonialists, they are working out the final destruction of the entirety of Southern Africa. And like good Rhodes scholars, they are oblivious of the obvious collapse of their own country which would result if their policy carries the day.

Not national interest, but the Queen's interest is their motivation.