EIR International

'Palacegate': Is Queen Elizabeth II sinking?

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

The following analysis was released by Mr. LaRouche on July 25.

Up to the moment this is written, only a handful of the U.S. population is aware of one of the biggest stories of the century, the threatened fall of the present British royal family.

Queen Elizabeth II's efforts to force a dumping of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, has set off a constitutional crisis, with the threat, that not only Queen Elizabeth II, but the entire House of Windsor, might be forced to abdicate.

This constitutional crisis in Britain has already spilled over into Washington D.C., under the cover of a fight over the issue of South Africa sanctions. President Reagan has taken the side of Prime Minister Thatcher; the leadership of the U.S. Congress has lined up behind the Queen. The Soviet government has lined up in support of the Queen, together with most of the Commonwealth governments of former British colonies.

Although the liberal press has suppressed coverage of most of the facts massively covered in the London press, the exploding constitutional crisis around the British monarchy is probably one of the major world developments of the present century.

How the crisis erupted

The crisis exploded into public view amidst last-minute preparations for the royal wedding. A high-ranking official of the British Royal family's private household leaked a public attack on Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher to the London press. The official reported that the Queen wished to crush Mrs. Thatcher over the issue of South Africa sanctions, and also indicated the Queen's reported displeasure with Mrs. Thatcher over other issues, including Britain's support for President Reagan against Libyan dictator Qaddafi.

Legally, whoever caused that leak of the Queen's political opinions to be issued, that leak creates a constitutional crisis for the monarchy. Either the Queen repudiates the leak, and discharges those Royal family officials responsible, or the Queen could be forced to abdicate on grounds of a serious breach of British law. Since the Queen herself has set forth publicly some of the same political views attributed to her by the leak, she would have to go much further than merely repudiate the leakers to satisfy those who would prefer the entire House of Windsor be expelled from the monarchy.

The Queen's recent statements are only the tip of the iceberg. There was already ominous rumbling against the House of Windsor within the British Establishment, months before the Queen's unconstitutional intervention into the issue of South Africa sanctions. The cause of this spring's rumbling against the House of Windsor was chiefly two interrelated issues: a growing resentment against the Royal Household's increasingly pro-socialist, and pro-Soviet connections and leanings, as visible increasingly since the Harold Wilson government of the 1960s; the horrifying prospect that the Queen might soon abdicate, in favor of Soviet agent Armand Hammer's crony, the Prince of Wales. To those within the British Establishment who know the Prince's connections and proclivities, Prince Charles is the "pits" of the Royal family.

The impetus for this growing anger against the House of Windsor, was growing fear of Soviet aggressive intentions among patriotic circles. Since the Wilson government of the 1960s, the monarchy's circles have played a leading role in promoting accommodations to Moscow which seem to many insiders as a replay of Neville Chamberlain's appeasement of Hitler. This appeaser role of the Royal Household is made much worse by that household's use of close collaboration between the Commonwealth organization and Willy Brandt's

Socialist International, as a leading part of the forces deployed to assist in imposing Soviet-appeasement policies on governments of the West.

The Palace leaks set off the simmering crisis caused by the Queen's earlier personal, also unlawful interventions into politics. The Royal Family's zeal to push through a Soviet appeasement policy, caused the Queen herself, as well as other members of the Royal Household, to abandon caution, to the point of plunging into flagrant and repeated violations of the law, in a degree beyond the tolerance of a growing portion of the Establishment. The real issue is not merely that the Windsors committed open and impeachable violations of law, but that they did so in service to a policy of appeasement of the Soviet dictatorship's imperial appetites.

This issue affects directly most of the major strategic issues of the present time: U.S. and Atlantic-Alliance military policy, Middle East policy, Africa policy, international monetary policy, the issues of narcotics trafficking and AIDS, and any others. The essence of the matter is, that the House of Windsor is key to the Moscow-appeasement faction inside the Commonwealth, the U.S.A., and Britain, and closely allied with the Socialist International, and with the Venice-centered Moscow-appeaser factions on the continent of Europe. In brief, the House of Windsor is at the center of the Anglo-Venetian-Soviet "Trust" arrangement. Leading political forces in various parts of the planet will come down on one side or another of these issues, as they align either with the forces behind Prime Minister Thatcher, or the Moscow-appeaser circles allied with the House of Windsor.

Whatever the outcome of this constitutional crisis in Britain today, at last, a big chunk of the truth of postwar history is coming out into the open.

The deepest of the issues involved, is the radical, pro-Soviet changes in the doctrine of the Anglican Church, as introduced under the prominent sponsorship of Archbishop Robert Runcie. This change is implicitly key to British patriots' motives for seeing the defeat of the House of Windsor as urgent, and the abdication of that entire House as probably necessary.

The House of Hanover, since self-renamed the House of Windsor, was elected to the British monarchy by a 1701 Act of Parliament known as "The Act of Settlement." In other words, the British monarchy of today is not a legitimate monarchy, but a creation of the Parliament, subject to the pleasure of the Parliament.

The right of Hanover to succeed Queen Anne, the last Stuart, was conferred upon the sponsor of Gottfried Leibniz, Electress Sophia. The conditions of the election of Electress Sophia's House of Hanover, centered around the elected monarch's defense of the Anglican faith. This condition Queen Elizabeth has implicitly violated, by appointing as Archbishop a Robert Runcie who has overturned the funda ental article of Anglican Christianity, the English equivalent of the Latin Creed's *Filioque,* as an act of appeasement of Moscow's demands to this effect.

To some, the Queen's implicit violation of the conditions for the House of Windsor's reign, might appear an obscure matter. Two important books now in preparation for early publication, will prove conclusively the past and present historic importance of this violation, as a first-rank strategic issue. One, by historian Graham Lowry, documents the relationship between events of Queen Anne's reign and the American Revolution later. The second, a study of the Anglo-Soviet Trust, down to the present day, includes documentation of the connection between Queen Anne's adversaries and the Western members of the Anglo-Soviet Trust over the past 60 years.

The Act of Settlement was adopted in the midst of a raging struggle throughout Western Europe, in which Queen Anne and Electress Sophia were on the opposite side to a Venice-directed cabal represented by the Duke of Marlborough (Churchill) inside England itself. Had Sophia succeeded Anne, Sophia's adviser, the scientist Gottfried Leibniz, would have become England's prime minister. Unfortunately, George Louis of Hanover, was a confederate of Marlborough and Marlborough's faction. With George I's accession as king of the United Kingdom, Queen Anne's opponents have ruled the monarchy and much of British policy ever since.

The takeover of Britain by the faction of Marlborough and George I, was the underlying cause of the American War of Independence, of 1775-1783, and the 1776 Declaration of Independence. The American leaders of the Revolution, like Benja in Franklin and George Washington, were children or grandchildren of the anti-Marlborough faction of Queen Anne's time. As Lowry's forthcoming book documents, the Virginia leaders of the American cause were a continuation

of the policies of Royal Governor Spotswood, a prominent adversary of Marlborough. Contrary to repeated assertions by Windsor's Prince Charles, the U.S. 1776-1783 war with Britain, was a result of the Americans' correctly understanding the philosophy of King George III's House, the same philosophy which the Venetian-run faction of Marlborough and George I had represented in 1716.

The forthcoming book on the Trust, will show, that the European factional forces associated with Marlborough and George I back in 1716, were essentially the same faction responsible for the establishment of the anti-American Holy Alliance at the 1815 Congress of Vienna. It was this same Venice-centered faction which backed the Russian Revolution of 1917, and which entered into the "Trust" agreements with the newly formed Bolshevik government's Trotsky, Fuerstenberg, and Dzerzhinsky.

Unfortunately, only a relatively small number of persons really understands this issue, a handful of historians and certain European aristocratic families with very long, multi-generation memories. Only a few look at today's events as merely current history, and look back many generations to discover the roots of today's history. Those who do so, know that the way nations behave today, is the result of traditions of religion and culture transmitted from one generation to the next, over many generations, even over centuries. The uneducated person, insists that such distant past history is "old hat," of little practical bearing upon events today; those of us who are on the inside of making events, know that the uneducated person's opinion is a sadly mistaken one.

There are those among the old families of Britain, and the professionals associated with those families, who recognize the importance of the 1815 Treaty of Vienna, and of the struggles around the Wars of the Spanish Succession a hundred years earlier. For those among us, inside and outside Britain, who have this knowledge, the alliance between Marlborough and George I in 1716 is one of the indispensable keys to understanding events today. We, inside and outside Britain, understand the earthshaking importance of the way the *Filioque* doctrine is embedded in the traditional Anglican Book of Common Prayer, and understand the monstrous danger of allowing a continuation of Windsor's role as a Moscow-appeaser, both in matters of religion, and strategically.

This reporter and relevant circles in Britain may see the matter somewhat differently in other respects, but on the issues of fundamental religious doctrine and appeasing Moscow, we tend toward practical agreements. From this reporter's non-British standpoint, he can understand, why some in Britain have come to the point of believing: "This House of Windsor has now long over-stayed its time." Even some old Tories are astonished to hear themselves echoing Oliver Cromwell's words to the Long Parliament toward that House: Go with God, but for God's sake, go.

Queen Elizabeth 'loathes' Thatcher

The present crisis of the House of Hanover erupted on July 20, when the *Sunday Times* of London published a background briefing on the Queen's views about the Thatcher government. In the terser versions published by the Monday tabloids, it was reported that "the Queen 'loathes' Thatcher, and Prince Charles feels the same way." Point for point, the leaky briefer lined the Queen up on the side of Russian policy towards the West, down to expressing her "fury" at Prime Minister Thatcher's having permitted President Reagan to deploy U.S. bombers against Qaddafi's Libya from British soil last April 15.

The British "constitution" is an unwritten assembly of custom, precedent, and guides to institutional behavior, in which the Queen has no views or opinions on political matters, except those given her by the British government. If there is a founding document, among that shifting body of precedent and custom known as the British constitution, it is not the Magna Carta testament to the feudal grandees' right to revolt, but rather the 1701 Act of Settlement. This Act, of Parliament, under which the House of Hanover took over the throne, defined the relations between the established Church, aristocratic families, and mandarin bureaucrats, on whose behalf the monarchy is presumed to act, *as a subordinate*.

Thus, the leak from the Palace crossed the borderline. The British press reaction, within the legal constraints on what may be said about the monarchy, was a call for the old meddler to be hanged.

The Queen was given till Sunday, July 27, to find and fire those responsible. Otherwise, the editor of the *Sunday Times* will take to national TV to report what is known about the leaker at the Palace-Gate.

Chief suspects, at this point, include: the Queen's press secretary Michael Shea; the Queen's private secretary Sir William Heseltine; Deputy Private Secretary Robert Fellowes: and Assistant Private Secretary Sir Kenneth Scott. A fifth name has also been raised: Prince Charles, who, according to Conservative parliamentarian Anthony Beaumont-Dark, "seems most likely, with his weird views."