

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."