

The fall of the House of Windsor is on

by Jeffrey Steinberg and Paul Goldstein

One year after Lyndon LaRouche wrote “The Coming Fall of the House of Windsor” (see *EIR*, Oct. 28, 1994, p. 12), the British monarchy is going through the gravest existential crisis since the American Revolution. And, while there are various groups in and around the London-based Club of the Isles oligarchy who are taking up factional positions on the fate of the Windsors, a far more fundamental battle over the issue of republicanism versus oligarchism has suddenly broken out in the pages of the Establishment media.

The ostensible trigger for this latest upsurge in Windsor-bashing was the British Broadcasting Corp.’s hour-long “Panorama” interview with Princess Diana, the estranged wife of Charles, the Prince of Wales and the heir-apparent to the English throne, which aired on British and American television in late November. In addition to her soap opera tales of marital infidelity, spousal abuse, and “low self-esteem,” Lady Di declared bluntly that Charles is unqualified to serve as king.

In the aftermath of her TV appearance, the very existence of the House of Windsor and the British monarchy has been called into question.

American Founding Fathers were right

In one of the most blunt commentaries, *Washington Post* columnist E.J. Dionne, Jr., who is known around town as a “close friend” of the Clinton White House, wrote a Nov. 28 column headlined “The King Is Dead,” in which he stated: “The world should be grateful to this Windsor lot for proving what our American forebears understood long ago: that republics are better than monarchies, that monarchism and its philosophical ally, aristocracy, are dead ideas that deserve to stay dead.”

Dionne quoted Tom Paine on the issue of hereditary monarchies:

“One of the strongest natural proofs of the folly of hereditary right in kings is that nature disapproves of it. Otherwise, she would not so frequently turn it into ridicule.” Paine’s comments, directed at “mad” King George III, fit the present Windsor lot to a tee.

Dionne warned, however, that the issue of republicanism

versus oligarchism is not a settled matter, even in the United States:

“Not even Pat Buchanan is lobbying for hereditary monarchy, even if he is a little soft on the old Hapsburg empire. But the truth is more complicated. Monarchical and aristocratic yearnings lie just under the surface in many of the democracies as voters translate their impatience with politicians as a group into a wish for something resembling ‘a better class of people’ to run things. If you want to be a real republican (that’s small ‘r’ and can be defined here as the opposite of a monarchist), you don’t have to love politicians, but you do need to respect their craft.”

He concluded:

“Politicians are what you get when you toss out the kings and princes. . . . Free citizens should neither need nor want hereditary or even personalized symbols of unity. Monarchies were junked precisely because people traded their faith in symbols for a confidence that, for better or worse, they could (and ought to) rule themselves.”

Asked about the significance of this debate about the future of the Windsors, Lyndon LaRouche, during a Nov. 29 “EIR Talks” radio interview, linked the fall of the British royal family to the imminent collapse of the present financial system.

“Obviously,” he said, “the institution of the monarchy is finished. Nothing can be done about it, because the entire international monetary system will end within months. There’s no way of getting around it. Either it will end by disintegrating, spontaneously, or it will be ended, that is, put out of its misery, with key parts being put into receivership by relevant governments.

“But either way,” he continued, “the kind of power, financial power and monetary power which London has exerted, is coming to an end. And in the process, it’s obvious that the British monarchy, in its present form at least, is doomed. It’s an archaic institution anyway, and who needs it?”

“So various people in the situation are playing it. On the one side, you have some people associated with [former British prime minister] Mrs. [Margaret] Thatcher, who never got along with the queen anyway, but for different reasons than I did (I don’t get along with Mrs. Thatcher, as you know), are playing the Lady Di side. Others are playing it.

“Some people who are in the British oligarchy, essentially, even though they’re not Brits by pedigree—they’re Dutch, Germans, and so forth—from the outside are also very upset, and think the monarchy is anachronous and should be discontinued.

“So, one should not look at the affair as a soap opera,” LaRouche cautioned, “even though it has some aspects of that. But this is a reflection, a symptom, of the doom of a long out-lived archaic institution, the British monarchy. And this is the way it goes.”

Ravings from the royal fringe

The Princess Di appearance on BBC, in rekindling the “Royals” debate, has dragged some bizarre proponents of the *ancien regime* out of the woodwork.

On Nov. 29, Donald Forman, head of the Monarchist League, a London-based advocacy group peddling the revival of every dead and near-dead royal household on the European continent, told reporters that “republicanism doesn’t work.” Citing the example of the current chaos in France, and recent coverage in the French daily *Le Figaro* attempting to rehabilitate the reputation of Napoleon III, Forman argued that there is at least 20% support among the French electorate for a revival of either the Bourbon, Orleans, or Bonaparte royal houses.

The following day, former London *Times* editor-in-chief Lord William Rees-Mogg penned a rabid *Times* commentary defending royal blood lines. “In the 20th century,” he wrote, “the hereditary principle has been widely discredited in application to human beings, though it is still generally accepted for race horses. Yet the more the scientists discover about the human brain, the more clear it becomes that brain structures are genetically determined physical realities, like our noses or our muscles. . . . Kings are successful both because they have the necessary mental attributes and because they are trained to be kings. It seems likely that training on its own cannot produce a great monarch, any more than it can produce a Derby winner.”

On a slightly more mentally balanced note, royal biographer A.N. Wilson wrote in the *New York Times* on Nov. 25 that “no one can doubt that [Princess Di’s BBC interview] was a skillfully organized attack on the institution of the monarchy itself. Not just on Prince Charles. Not just on the queen, whom Diana obviously hates. But on the monarchy.”

Wilson proceeded to deliver about the closest thing to a direct threat to the Princess of Wales:

“The war is not about individuals. It is about the oldest and most durable constitutional monarchy in the world. The example of Wallis Simpson and Edward VIII should be enough to tell Diana that when it comes to fighting a war, the Establishment can get very nasty, indeed, and that for all her undoubted popularity, if she continues to rock the boat in this way, the Establishment will simply get rid of her.”

Nicholas Soames, the Tory deputy defense minister and grandson of Winston Churchill who is a close pal of Prince Charles, publicly denounced Lady Di as a “paranoid.”

Two tracks

First and foremost, the assault on the House of Windsor is part of the ongoing war between Washington and London, since President Clinton made it clear that he was no longer interested in the “special relationship” that has dominated Anglo-American affairs since the death of President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1945.

Second, the unraveling of the international financial system that has been one key power base for the Club of the Isles, has provoked a “falling out among thieves.” Over the past several years, Dutch, German, and American financial institutions have moved in to bail out some of London’s oldest and most regal institutions, including Barings Bank, Lloyd’s, and Morgan Grenfel. As a result, there has been a power tilt within the Club of the Isles, with the House of Windsor and the City of London being relatively weakened, and a Dutch-German combination gaining strength.

Among the British elites, there is a revival of the debate that broke out at the time of the American Revolution, when some oligarchical families seriously considered dumping the Hanoverians altogether and running the empire directly through the British East India Company and its adjuncts.

According to several well-placed sources, today there are at least six factions inside the British Establishment waging a war over the future of the Windsors and their own political survival. Among the monarchists, there are advocates of the status quo, who wish to see Queen Elizabeth II remain on the throne until her death. This group wishes to see Prince Philip reassert his position as “chief operations officer” of the Club of the Isles. A second pro-monarchist group sees the need to reform and “downsize” the Crown in order to assure its survival into the 21st century. Press magnate Rupert Murdoch, and the London *Times* apparatus more broadly, are representative of this grouping.

The Thatcherites, including the former prime minister herself, oppose the queen because of what they see as her dismal failure to preserve the global role of Britain, particularly her failure to preserve the vital Anglo-American “special relationship.” The Rothschild banking interests, which have for a century served as the financial backbone of the Windsor Dynasty, are now hedging their bets against the monarchy in the interest of assuring their survival.

British Prime Minister John Major has steered the current Tory apparatus into the camp that favors preserving the monarchy via “reform.” It was Major who orchestrated the Windsors’ decision to “voluntarily” pay taxes. And, while one faction of the Labour Party, associated with its present chairman, Tony Blair, is also out to preserve the monarchy through reform—possibly including the drawing up of a written constitution significantly reducing the power of the monarchy—another Labour faction is pushing for the total elimination of the monarchy and the full integration of Britain into the united Europe of the Maastricht Treaty.

While this British political intrigue is of slightly more political significance than the bed-hopping antics of Charles and Di, the real underlying issue, which has been LaRouche’s point of emphasis for years, is whether this dying oligarchical system is going to pass benignly from the earth or take down much of humanity with it in the onrush of a New Dark Age.