

# The monarchy moves in

The ascension of Margaret Thatcher to the Prime Ministership of Great Britain has nothing to do with the internal politics of Britain—a fact attested to by the response on this side of the Atlantic.

No sooner had the “Iron Lady” been installed in 10 Downing Street than the entire herd of Republican stalking-horses for Gen. Alexander Haig’s presidential candidacy heralded the “Tory” victory as a signal to proceed with union-busting and a Cold War military buildup in the United States. An equally vociferous “left” emerged, around the persons of Gov. Jerry Brown and Sen. Ted Kennedy, to declare “class war” on behalf of shutting down the U.S. nuclear energy industry.

Were this constellation to dominate U.S. politics entirely, it would seal the revenge of King George III over his arch-enemy Benjamin Franklin. Thatcher’s advisors and her cabinet (see EUROPE) are striking for the direct presence of the royal family’s first cousins, no longer disguised as Labor and Tory party politicians. The Thatcher government, inclusive of its international “left-wing” opposition, thus represents the emergence of the British monarchy in its *own name* to make a final desperate effort to maintain oligarchical rule over the world and reverse the achievement of the American Revolution.

The monarchy’s strategy was discussed at the April 26 meeting of the secretive Bilderberg club in Baden, Austria. According to inside reports from that meeting, a top agenda item was the deployment of Bilderbergers to make contact with “religious minorities” in the Middle East—particularly in Saudi

Arabia—to replace existing, production regimes with the kind of feudalist “revolution” now ruling Iran. The seemingly incongruous hobnobbing of Europe’s oligarchic elite and its top ideologues with the unwashed mullahs is explained by the overriding policy objective of the Thatcher government project of ruling layers of British intelligence, also discussed at Baden and set into motion by the May 6 Bank of International Settlements meeting in Switzerland. That policy depends on “freezing” the European Monetary System within the iron corset of the International Monetary Fund’s “conditionalities” policies toward the Third World—a demand for a global dark age.

If the EMS were now steered toward “Phase II” of its operations, along lines currently proposed by the Giscard government’s spokesmen, of extending credit for high-technology agricultural and industrial development to developing sector nations, the continued power of

the City of London over world finance—and over international political affairs—would be irreparably broken.

Although President Giscard of France and Chancellor Schmidt of West Germany proceeded from sound traditions and perspectives in initiating the European Monetary System, the theoretical basis for a successful “Phase II” implementation of the EMS is unique to the work of American economist Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. We refer to, most recently, the October 1978 *EIR* supplement by LaRouche, “The Theory of the European Monetary Fund,” and LaRouche’s computerized “Riemannian” economic model published by this review two weeks ago.

It is for this reason that the architects of the “Thatcher project” now regard the accelerating spread of support for LaRouche’s U.S. presidential candidacy as the greatest threat to their designs.

—Nora Hamerman

## The Week in Brief

As history has repeatedly shown, treaties do not necessarily lead to peace, and the prognosis for the Carter Administration’s new SALT II treaty is **not good**. Even the negotiators are not hopeful. Said Secretary of State Cyrus Vance: “This agreement reduces the **likelihood of nuclear war**.” He was joined by Secretary of Defense Harold Brown: “Even with SALT, we will have to **expand our strategic nuclear efforts**, and expand our defenses...”

As for the **Soviet Union**, after a total day of silence, Radio Moscow reported May 10: “**According to the U.S. State Department**, a SALT agreement has been reached.”

What’s more, SALT just may be Alexander Haig’s ticket to power, and his foreign policy commitments are well known. As one reporter put it, all eyes are on Washington in expectation of a “titanic debate on SALT . . . comparable only to the League of Nations Senate fight that