

Do you believe in British royal family magic?

by Mark Burdman

Sovereign: Elizabeth II and the Windsor Dynasty

by Roland Flamini

Delacorte Press, New York, 1991
440 pages, hardbound, \$21.95

Roland Flamini's book is a fawning account of Queen Elizabeth II, written on the occasion of the Queen's 65th birthday. Its preciousness makes for difficult, at times unbearable, reading. But perversely, it is what makes the book an interesting curiosity piece, as an alternative, to, say, visiting the zoo. It is the kind of book that might approximate what "Lillibet" herself would want written about her.

As Flamini repeatedly makes the point, the essential image that is associated with the monarchy, and with popular attitudes toward it, is *magic*. He is obviously faithful to the goal of maintaining this aura. People project their own fantasies onto the British royal family. At various times in this century, the British population has suffered horrible deprivation, yet has titillated over this or that royal ritual or special occasion. Flamini recounts that when the Queen visited Nigeria, then still a British colony, in the mid-1950s, the crowds lined the streets of Lagos to cheer. Meanwhile, eight-foot walls of corrugated iron were erected, to hide from visibility the slums in which the vast majority of the population was living. Again, magic—in its brutal and crass form.

So, the real question posed by reviewing the content of this book, is one for "us normal folk": Do we need magic in our lives? That is a fundamental strategic question. Institu-

tions with such power, ruthlessness, and capacity for evil-doing as the House of Windsor (actually, House of Mountbatten Windsor) could not survive for long, if the "normal folk," not only British subjects but also American citizens who seem perversely hell-bent on becoming British subjects again, did not want to have a British royal family on which they can project their fantasies and hardly-rational desires.

This is a strategic point in a second sense. Belief in magic not only degrades the mind and destroys our ability to think, but leads to disastrous consequences in the real, physical world.

An exaggeration? As the backdrop to this book, consider the past months' brutal events in the Gulf and the May 14-27 trip of Queen Elizabeth II to the United States, including her May 16 address to a joint session of Congress.

It was the British who were behind the Gulf war, in all its aspects, a fact which was for all intents and purposes admitted by the British *Guardian* newspaper on May 2. Back on Feb. 26, the London *Times* reported that Her Majesty was intimately involved in the most intricate details of the course of the war, so intimately involved that British insiders were obliged to deny that she was Britain's "warrior queen." Soon after the *Times* article was published, influentials in the British establishment came up with the brilliant idea for her to address a joint session of Congress. This was accepted on the U.S. side. According to British press accounts, one theme of her speech will be to "thank the American population" for the Gulf war. Soon thereafter, she will reportedly give an honorary knighthood to Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf.

Is it only a coincidence, that this Schwarzkopf is a practicing magician? The fact is, aside from the massive killing, much of the Gulf conflict has consisted in hoodwinking the

American people into believing and seeing what the orchestrators of this mayhem wanted them to see. Unfortunately, too many Americans wanted to believe the lies they were told, including that the "special relationship" with the British is sacred above all else and that the British are "our best allies."

Monarchical pillars of power

With such thoughts as backdrop, this reviewer feels obliged to say a few things about the real nature of the British monarchy, stripped of the magic. This is not the whole story, but it gets at some of the essentials. At times, it draws upon facts and details in Flamini's book.

Queen Elizabeth II is the latest in a line of ruthless cutthroats who have occupied the throne of Great Britain since 1714, the year the House of Hanover was founded. (Under Queen Victoria, the name was formally changed to "House of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha," while the name "House of Windsor" was created as recently as World War I, by King George V, in order to weaken the historical association of the monarchy with Germany during the war. Prince Philip, who adopted the surname Mountbatten under tutelage from his uncle Lord Louis Mountbatten, managed to obtain a formal agreement for the future change of the monarchy's name to "House of Mountbatten Windsor," which appellation has already been adopted by Princess Anne). Elizabeth II represents the continuity of the same monarchical abomination, earlier personified in the Hanoverian King George III, against which American patriots shed their blood to be free.

The Queen is the spokesman for, and representative of, a vast oligarchical power structure, which more or less overlaps the British Empire over which the House of Hanover/Saxe-Coburg-Gotha/Windsor presided for well over two centuries. This monarchy is upheld by the following pillars of power:

- The Queen is the *primus inter pares* of a European monarchical-aristocratic structure, composed of both ruling and deposed royal houses. The House of Windsor is related, in one form or another, to the royal houses of Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Greece, the Balkans, and others, as well as to the various princes, dukes, and other nobility who still wield considerable power in Germany. As Flamini notes, Elizabeth has "some 60 German uncles, aunts and cousins, or many more than she [has] British." In the crisis-torn Balkans, at this moment, in Bulgaria, in Yugoslavia (Serbia), in Romania, there is an active and growing movement to bring back monarchical rule—which is exactly what her father George VI advocated after World War II. According to the May 8 London *Times*, Crown Prince Peter of Yugoslavia, "cousin of Prince Philip and godson of the Queen," is hoping to be able to return to Yugoslavia within two years, and to create there a monarchy "on the British model."

In Flamini's view, "a natural role for the British monarchy in the next century would be as the leading royal house

in a united states of Europe." The Windsors are the "success story" in the global monarchical complex.

- The Queen is the wealthiest woman, and certainly among the wealthiest individuals, on this planet. Writes Flamini: "By 1987, *Fortune* magazine was granting Elizabeth II an accolade of her own as the richest woman in the world. Her personal wealth had grown to \$7.4 billion. London analysts placed her shareholdings at no less than \$3.3 billion. The Duchy of Lancaster, her main real estate holding in the United Kingdom, generated an untaxed rental income of \$2.4 million in 1986. The following year, the total estimated value of her art, jewelry, real estate, and horses was \$4.1 billion. And 1988 was a good racing year. With 32 horses in training, she recorded 13 wins, 12 seconds, 5 thirds, and 9 fourth places in 79 races run, to earn over \$120,000. Her Civil List allowance had also increased appreciably, to nearly \$6.8 billion, but to most Britons, the monarchy is still considered cost-effective."

That last sentence betrays the cynicism with which British royalty looks at its own subjects. The Civil List is the Queen's "allowance," ostensibly for palace expenses. It is granted by the British government, and comes from the taxes of the wretched British population. The Queen, however, on the basis of an agreement her Hanoverian forebear George III made with Parliament, pays no taxes, for income or inheritance. A report in *Harpers* magazine earlier this year said that the Queen earns £2 million a day on her vast investments, forcing her to issue a denial Feb. 20, claiming she had no property overseas and that estimates of her wealth are "wild speculation."

As for the royal family's art and jewel collections, most of this has come over the generations in the form of "gifts" from the British population or even as tribute from the former British colonies. Imagine the gumption of a palace declaration about the Queen receiving precious jewels "from the population of Burma." The art is a centuries-old collection, which the current Queen has done little to procure or add to. As for the ubiquitous horses: Some of these are precious gifts from those Arabian princes, to save the tyrannical rule of whom hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of lives are being sacrificed in the Anglo-American-French imperialist crusade in the Gulf.

Her father George VI liked to refer to the House of Windsor as "The Firm," and that is exactly what it is. One little-known aspect of "The Firm's" history is that this vast wealth has been built up only during the last century. When Queen Victoria took the throne in the early 19th century, the monarchy was deeply in debt. But during her reign and afterwards, as the British Empire was built to its greatest extent, tribute from India, South Africa, Burma, and other colonies, often in the form of jewels, replenished the royal coffers.

Flamini's references to \$3.3 billion in "shareholdings," and to "real estate," are probably extremely conservative estimates, of a worldwide net of vast property holdings and

investments in real estate and other entities. The monarchy can also draw upon the wealth passing through the City of London, in the sense that the financial and bureaucratic institutions of the palace are intricately interconnected to the City of London banking and financial center.

This vast power subsumes the unregulated, "offshore" banking centers of the Commonwealth, through which vast sums of drug money are laundered. Of course, the monarchy doesn't like attention being drawn to all this. For years, the obsessive ID-format lie that "Lyndon LaRouche is the man who says the Queen of England pushes drugs" has been restated, like the *Hare Krishna* chant, in literally thousands of slander articles worldwide, because LaRouche drew attention to the illicit money transfers through offshore centers.

Those granted senior positions in Buckingham Palace are part of a closely knit conglomerate of families and vested interests, often with important ties to intelligence and other operations, what Flamini refers to as "interlocking relationships within the magic circle." For example, Sir Michael Charteris (now Lord Charteris and the just retired Chancellor of Eton public school) was a senior British intelligence official in the Middle East before becoming a senior aide to the Queen. Or Sir Michael Adeane, the Queen's Secretary starting in the 1950s, had been the British liaison to American intelligence during World War II.

- Queen Elizabeth II presides over the British Commonwealth, and has devoted much of her life to strengthening that institution. In her first political speech, while still a princess traveling with her father in South Africa after World War II, she lauded "the great Imperial Commonwealth." Obviously, one of her main obsessions is to bring the United States *into* that formation. She began this mission in 1957, during her first state visit, with her effort to patch up a British-American rift resulting from the 1956 Suez crisis. By the time she had left, British Ambassador to Washington Sir Harold Caccia was chirping, "She has buried George III for good!"

Pagan head of a Christian confession

- Elizabeth is the head of the Church of England, and by this, the central figure in the world Anglican communion. It may not be widely known, but Her Majesty's official title is "Elizabeth the Second, by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and of Her Other Realms and Territories Queen, Head of the Commonwealth, Defender of the Faith." In a literal sense, Britain is a theocracy. In fact, with Henry VIII in the 16th century, it became the first Protestant theocracy in the world—once driving force in the building of the British Empire.

But that wouldn't be quite so bad, if the monarchy supported the Christianity to which the Church of England's creed holds its believers. Paradoxical as it may seem, the monarchy is also the controller of English Freemasonry, the head of which is the Duke of Kent. That, too, might explain

the obsessive "LaRouche and the Queen" ID-format, as if LaRouche were being subjected to the ostracism which Freemasonry carries out against its enemies.

Also, it is no exaggeration to say that the monarchy is at the helm of a global *pagan-gnostic* anti-Christian movement, operating under the overall category of "ecologism" or "environmentalism." Prince Philip has been the international president of the World Wide Fund for Nature (formerly World Wildlife Fund) for most of the WWF's existence since its creation in the early 1960s. In Washington, at a press conference in mid-May 1990, he openly stated his preference for "pagan" religions over the monotheistic "religions of the book," Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. His son Prince Charles has followed in his footsteps.

The classical pianist as hero

by Philip Ulanowsky

Claudio Arrau Signature Performance Series:

Beethoven's Concerto No. 5 (The Emperor), Op. 73, Kultur International Films, W. Long Branch, N.J., 85 minutes, color, hi-fi, Dolby stereo, \$29.95

It is recognized among those who are fond of classical music, but also among many who have not had much exposure to it, that in some way, classical music represents the best impulses and the best achievements of our society in general. Many parents and educators ardently wish for better role models and heroes for our youth than those effectively dictated (I use the term advisedly) by the media.

Must one really be happy about the Mr. Ts and the "gang green" creatures, just because they are supposedly against drugs? Isn't there something better? Of course there is. If you want to see it, find a copy of the 1987 Video Artists International videotape on the return of world-renowned pianist Claudio Arrau to his native Chile in 1984. I am not a video fan (our home is TV-less and happier without); but this videotape is wonderful.

Arrau, a man in his *eighties* at the time, returned to his homeland in 1984 after 17 years' absence, to give a series of concerts and master classes. One of only several of this older