
Interview: Anthony Beaumont-Dark

'The monarchy is not there to put forward their own views to the public'

Conservative Member of Parliament, Anthony Beaumont-Dark, is a Birmingham, U.K. investment analyst, and a member of the Birmingham Stock Exchange. Mr. Beaumont-Dark has been a member of Parliament since 1979. The interview was conducted in London by Laurent Murawiec.

EIR: Britain has been rocked this summer by the report, published in a major newspaper, that the Queen held views strikingly contrary to those of the prime minister, and this, on a whole series of major issues, such as South Africa, Libya, the coal strike, and social policies generally. Could you summarize the affair for us and state your view of it?

Beaumont-Dark: My view is that it is quite unique for the Royal Family to be involved in any of their views being expressed in public. We live under a constitutional monarchy where the monarch always *has* to accept the views of the government of the day, Conservative or Labour. The monarch can advise and caution, which is what is said in the Constitution, but the monarch is not there to put forward their own views to the public—this is contrary to the Constitution and quite unheard-of. Mr. Michael Shea gave some views to Mr. Neill of the *Sunday Times* and Mr. Neill purports to have read over the telephone what he was going to write back to Mr. Shea, two or three times. So there was every opportunity for the latter to withdraw his views, and since they were not withdrawn, and since Mr. Shea knew the delicacy of the situation, and also since the monarch did not disown those views, those views then must reasonably be held to be the views of the monarch. This is not constitutional, and is an unwise thing to do. . . .

EIR: But this is exactly what was done. . . .

Beaumont-Dark: . . . I believe they did. It is well known that Lord Mountbatten, who was the great mentor of the Royal Family, was a man who held some very left-wing views. And this seems now to be perpetuated and this could be dangerous. . . .

EIR: "Some very left wing views" held by Mountbatten . . . ?

Beaumont-Dark: He had said that if he could vote, he would vote Labour. He had no vote, but he was a very prominent

member of the Royal Family, and sometimes people in such positions tend to hold views like that. He held views, so it is said, upon atomic weapons, which in the end did not tally with the views of the government of the day in his time. This and similar kinds of views stated by members of the Royal Family, stretched the British Constitution to a dangerous extent. . . . I don't think there is any analogy with Edward VIII, and indeed it would be nonsense to talk about an abdication issue but obviously if conflict went on between the elected government and the monarch of the day, it would place the government in a situation where they might have to resign and fight an election, which would place the monarchy in a position of mortal danger. . . .

EIR: Parliamentary supremacy has been attacked . . . that was a cause for England's Civil War in the 17th century, wasn't it?

Beaumont-Dark: The people would side with Parliament again today, I'm confident of that. Democratic supremacy is the only form of government that could survive in the modern world, unless we changed the basis for the government of Great Britain, which happily is highly unlikely.

EIR: This means that many in Britain might presently be avidly consulting records of Cromwell's and Milton's actions. . . .

Beaumont-Dark: I would hope, if I may say so, that those who advise the Queen might be doing that as well. . . .

EIR: The Prince of Wales is closely associated to an old associate of his late uncle Mountbatten, Armand Hammer, widely reported to be a top-flight Soviet operative. . . . Isn't that somewhat unseemly for the heir to the throne?

Beaumont-Dark: I don't know if Dr. Hammer is an agent of anybody, but he is very close to Communism and he may be burned, and I would not want him to put our Prince too close to the flame. . . . And Dr. Hammer seems to be always able to make money out of the fact that he has a reputation for helping Communism. He puts it down to helping "peaceful coexistence" with the West. It seems exceptionally fortunate that this also works out to Dr. Hammer's own best interests.

EIR: Now, let's go from the [constitutional] form of the summer's quarrel to its [political] content. . . .

Beaumont-Dark: The problem the Queen has, I think, is that Royalty still seems to think that we still have an Empire, which we don't. We have a Commonwealth, which really means nothing much. Commonwealth countries take care of themselves. The Queen is supposed to be the "head of state" of it. Any sovereign has to recognize that they are first of all Queen of Great Britain. . . .

EIR: What of Libya? Mrs. Thatcher's government had granted assistance to the U.S. Air Force for the bombing of Tripoli, and that seems to have been a reason for the Royal quarrel. . . .

Beaumont-Dark: And that was entirely right to bomb Tripoli. It was unfortunate that it had to be done, but it was the right thing to do. It was the right thing to do for Britain and for Western Europe. . . .

EIR: The next part of the quarrel was that Mrs. Thatcher was "socially divisive." Some newspapers reported this summer that the Queen had let it be known that she was "not part of the right-wing establishment" and held rather more "left-wing social views."

Beaumont-Dark: I'm not a right-winger myself. I don't like right-wing policies. Ideally I'd like to see a lot more done in the inner areas, but it has to be kept in touch with financial reality. The Socialist idea of spending another 20 billion pounds [on various social items] is rather splendid, the trouble is that it would cause even more trouble for the supposed beneficiaries in the form of inflation and even more unemployment. Often Royalty is more idealistic than realistic. . . .

EIR: Recently, a Court in Malaysia sentenced two Australians to hang for drug smuggling. There was an outcry, especially in the West, about those whites being executed.

Beaumont-Dark: The Malaysians were perfectly right. The law of Malaysia makes it perfectly clear when you enter the country, that the death penalty is the mandatory punishment for drug smuggling. People know what they should expect. It would be intolerable for Chinese or Malaysians to be hung and whites not. I do not like hanging people, but above all, I hate drugs. . . .

EIR: There is one profession that has to be singled out among those who aid and abet the enemy within, drugs, and that is a goodly part of the banking profession. The \$500 billion a year drug trade could never exist if banks did not launder the proceeds.

Beaumont-Dark: That is one of the things that Western governments ought to concentrate on—the laundering of the moneys; it ought to be made perfectly clear to banks that if any of that laundering can be brought home to their door,

they will suffer the most grievous financial penalty of all. Anyone who makes money out of drugs must be treated with the harshest penalty: Drugs are taking away people's future, their lives; banks have to be made accountable for where their money comes from; at present, they are allowed to get away too lightly by saying, "We only deal with money." Drugs, the enemy within, one that can rip apart a society within one single generation, it is the fifth column of our age.

EIR: As early as 1967, the Soviets undertook to take over a large part of the world drug trade. . . .

Beaumont-Dark: I would not put anything past them. . . . Dictating to people is their policy—but mankind is meant to be free, free from fear. But when you see thousands of people to this day trying to climb over this Wall in Berlin—it stems from an evil philosophy. Communism will not cease being evil until it demolishes this Wall. It's no use people saying that Mr. Gorbachov is a better man, he's rather more dangerous than Mr. Khrushchov or Mr. Bulganin—more dangerous because he looks "more human." I have not seen one real sign of the gulags being closed down, of the Wall being pulled down. Until that were down, Gorbachov is and remains worse, not better.

EIR: Let us talk about AIDS. Institutional and "expert" opinion, until very recently, had claimed that only the "high-risk groups" were threatened. . . .

Beaumont-Dark: That is a kind of placebo people are fed with to make them think that there is no great risk except that involved in personal sexual relationship. But AIDS really is the Black Death of our time, it is growing in geometric progression, not arithmetically. That is where the Western world should pool its resources until we find a cure, a solution . . . we need a crash program. Time is not on our side.

EIR: An initiative in California, Proposition 64, will be presented to the electorate in the form of a referendum in the coming November, which aims at having legislation, full public health legislation actually implemented against AIDS. Would you comment?

Beaumont-Dark: . . . Anything that will encourage governments to act more forcefully and put more money into fighting the disease and taking the measures appropriate to fight it, is welcome. The point, of course, is not to persecute the victims, be they homosexual—I find this particular way of living distasteful—we do not want to say that gays are all evil people, they have a right to their lives, as all human beings have.

EIR: How do you situate yourself, personally, with respect to the tradition of Oliver Cromwell and John Milton?

Beaumont-Dark: Had I lived in those days, I am confident that I would have sided with Cromwell and John Milton. I am confident that I would do the same thing today.