

Great Britain hit by 'Pearl Harbor Effect'

by Mark Burdman

In the two weeks following the Aug. 31 killing of Princess Diana, the British House of Windsor has lost whatever it might have been hoping to preserve, of what the Chinese refer to as the "Mandate of Heaven." A dramatic, apparently almost overnight phase-change has occurred, in the attitude of the usually docile British population toward the Windsors, a process that *EIR* Founding Editor Lyndon LaRouche has likened to a "Pearl Harbor Effect" in the U.K. In parallel, and of ultimately even greater strategic significance, there is a perceptible shift occurring in the disposition of the American population toward a royal house that Americans have tended to regard with the awe usually reserved for Hollywood celebrities.

In an interview with the weekly radio program "EIR Talks" on Sept. 10, LaRouche stated bluntly: "The House of Windsor is on its last legs, and I think this typifies the situation we're in globally today. . . . The British system has come to a time in its existence when the British monarchy is doomed, not because of what it did to Princess Di—it's doomed because it's *doomed*. It has no constituency, as it used to have. And, it acted like a dinosaur in the last stage of existence of its species. . . . The Queen is now very vulnerable—and she's also very desperate."

'A quiet, bloodless revolution'

The assessment that the Windsors are in a desperate state, is shared by important figures in the British Establishment, many of whom are alarmed that there is a smell of "revolution" in the air.

In a Sept. 8 on-the-record discussion with *EIR*, Harold Brooks-Baker, one of Britain's experts on British royalty, spoke of the dramatic events in Britain of Sept. 6, when millions of people turned out to mourn the murdered Princess, and an emotional funeral was held at Westminster Abbey, the which was watched, via television, by an estimated 2.5 billion people around the world. Brooks-Baker solemnly declared:

"This is a turning point in Britain. What you saw at Westminster Abbey this weekend, was not a funeral, but a quiet, bloodless revolution, similar to what happened in 1848"—the year when many of Europe's royal houses were overturned.

Brooks-Baker is the publishing director of *Burke's Peerage*, which documents Britain's noble and royal families. In 1994, he was one of those approached by *EIR*, for reactions to *EIR*'s Oct. 28, 1994 report, "The Coming Fall of the House of Windsor." It was that report, as we documented last week, that Princess Diana acknowledged, in a written communication to LaRouche representative Scott Thompson, having received with interest.

Almost three years later, and from his own pro-royalty standpoint, Brooks-Baker's assessment has converged on that of LaRouche. Notably, in an article in the Sept. 15 *Newsweek*, and released some days after his discussion with *EIR*, Brooks-Baker asked, "Can the House of Windsor survive the death of Diana?"—words almost identical to the title of *EIR*'s feature of last week.

Aspects of what occurred at Westminster Abbey on Sept. 6, had an almost eerily Shakespearean quality. Certainly the most dramatic moment, was the speech by the ninth Earl Spencer, Diana's brother, who created a shock. During his tribute to his sister, he launched an unmistakable attack on the Windsor family. Most unusual for a funeral at Westminster Abbey, the speech was applauded after Spencer finished speaking. There was also applause for him, from crowds listening to the speech on radio, at various gathering-points throughout London.

Princess Diana, her brother affirmed, was "a symbol of selfless humanity, . . . someone with a natural nobility who was classless, who proved in the last year that she needed no royal title to generate her particular brand of magic." This was a reference to the decision by the Queen and her closest advisers, after Diana's July 1996 divorce of Prince Charles,

to strip the Princess of the title, “Her Royal Highness.”

While Spencer’s most scathing attacks were directed at the news media and the “ever-present paparazzi,” it was clear that the target of his oration was the royal family. “It is a tribute to [Diana’s] level-headedness and strength that despite the most bizarre life imaginable after her childhood, she remained intact, true to herself,” Spencer said. Since the greater portion of her adult life was spent as a member of the Windsor family, until her divorce last year, there is no doubt as to what he meant by “the most bizarre life imaginable.”

Spencer focussed on how and why Diana was so hounded by the press, stating that “my own, and only, explanation” for this mad pursuit, “is that genuine goodness is threatening to those at the opposite end of the moral spectrum.” Of all the ironies about Diana, Spencer said, “perhaps the greatest is this; that a girl given the name of the ancient goddess of hunting was, in the end, the most hunted person of the modern age.” Diana’s brother noted that she would want her boys, William and Harry, to be protected from a similar fate, and he promised: “We will not allow them to suffer the anguish that used regularly to drive you to tearful despair.”

It was at this point, that he threw down the gauntlet to the royal family, over the issue of the rearing of Diana’s sons; the Windsors took custody of the boys last Sunday. He proclaimed: “Beyond that, on behalf of your mother and sisters, I pledge that we, your blood family, will do all we can to continue the imaginative and loving way in which you were steering these two exceptional young men, so that their souls are not simply immersed by duty and tradition, but can sing openly as you planned. We fully respect the heritage into which they have both been born, and will always respect and encourage them in their royal role. But we, like you, recognize the need for them to experience as many different aspects of life as possible, to arm them spiritually and emotionally for the years ahead. I know you would have expected nothing less from us.”

Of the speech, British historian and “constitutional expert” David Starkey, of the London School of Economics, commented on Sept. 9: “Not since Mark Antony roused the Roman mob over Caesar’s dead body, has such a political funeral tribute been delivered.”

The speech also contained a telling omission. There was not a single reference by Spencer, as protocol might normally dictate, to “the Mob,” as Queen Victoria was wont, in her day, to call the royal family. This is all the more remarkable, as, from Buckingham Palace to the site of the funeral, Spencer and the two boys walked behind the gun carriage carrying Diana’s casket, flanked by Prince Charles and Prince Philip on either side. One source knowledgeable on British affairs characterized Spencer’s speech as “a direct challenge to Prince Philip,” the Royal Consort. The protection of princes, the heirs to the throne, is regarded as the duty of the royal family, and particularly of Philip. But, the source noted, the Spencers, one of the oldest of England’s noble families with a family history dating back several hundred years, have never regarded the Windsors — formerly, the Hanovers, before they

changed their name to “Windsor” at the onset of World War I — as the rightful monarchs.

‘The Queen’s a pit bull’

As the week of Sept. 8 unfolded, the backlash against the Windsors’ unconscionable behavior, in response to Diana’s death, had reached the point, that a poll taken by the MORI group, showed at least one-third of those asked, desiring the immediate abdication of the Queen.

As we reported last week, a popular revolt against the Windsors’ behavior was reaching a crescendo, some 3-4 days after Diana’s death had been announced on the morning of Aug. 31. On the afternoon of Sept. 4, after intense pressure from British Prime Minister Tony Blair, Buckingham Palace announced that the Queen would be making an unusual national address, on the evening of Friday, Sept. 5. Usually, the Queen only “addresses the nation” on Christmas, or on exceptional occasions; her last such “special” address, was during the Persian Gulf War.

Blair and advisers were aware of the mood in the country, as millions of Britons expressed outrage at the behavior of a royal family that was huddling at its summer estate in Balmoral, Scotland, withholding comment on the tragic death of the Princess, and showing no sign of grief or tribute. The headlines in British papers on the morning of Sept. 5, proclaimed the reason behind Her Majesty’s breaking of silence: “The Queen Bows to Her Subjects,” read one; “Diana’s Army Cheers Victory,” read another. One woman quoted in the *Guardian* declared: “Diana’s army have forced the royal family to retreat and recognize how much the Princess was loved by her people.”

The Queen’s three-minute speech can, most charitably, be described as containing the emotional power of a report on

French government covers up for Diana’s murder

Next week’s issue of *EIR* will feature a story on the French government’s cover-up of evidence that Princess Diana’s death was murder. In an interview with “EIR Talks” on Sept. 9, Lyndon LaRouche said, “Princess Diana is the victim of a *murder*. The problem we have in this case, is the French government, for reasons of its own, reasons of its own *affinities* for the British monarchy at this time, has acted to cover up for the murder of Princess Diana and others, in Paris. . . . The French government is covering up and lying like hell — you should forgive the expression — but that’s, I think, a certain way to describe the French government, in terms of sulfurous and brimstone terms.”

Diana was groping for the meaning of life

These remarks by Lyndon LaRouche are excerpted from an interview with “EIR Talks” on Sept. 9.

. . . I don’t know her that well. We had some correspondence with her, which we’ve reported in *EIR*. The correspondence was not that significant overall, *except in this context*, because once you see *that* correspondence, you say, wait a minute, this lady was in touch with LaRouche and Company, which, in itself, puts a far different complexion on her work, activities, thinking, and so forth, than the media was presenting, particularly the royal family, as such. Then you look a little deeper, and you say, this coincides with the fact that she was also very close to a Mother Teresa, who died shortly after the Princess did, who was in a sense her protector, a woman who had, in a sense, put Princess Di under her wing to try to advise, help, and guide her, the way Mother Teresa was.

This woman was not simply some “playgirl”—she may have had problems, but she was groping for solutions to the meaning of life, and her relationship with Mother Teresa was part of this groping for solutions to the meaning of life, or the meaning of her life, looking for a mission in life, seeking to drink the cup of Gethsemane, whatever that might prove to be to her. And thus, our coverage, and our

contact with her, which, in a sense, was *her* doing, more than ours—we just wrote to her, and reported certain things to her which we thought—wanted to see how she would react, what she would think about it, and she responded, in a very routine kind of way, just honest, normal sort of thing, but that revealed something about her . . . That’s why we decided to publish it, because the very *fact* that this occurred, is sufficient to prove that everything that is being said about her, about that “royal majesty,” is a crock, and has no correspondence to reality.

So that was the point. She was not simply a “playgirl,” or some confused creature. No, she was a woman who suddenly found herself caught up in terrible conditions, abused by this *terrible* royal house, and tried to find a way out of the mess, and she deserves respect for what she was trying to do. Most people, these days, most Americans, for example, are people who are not in too much different circumstances. You have Generation X, for example: The entirety of Generation X is running around, trying to look for a meaning in life, and having a sense, that somehow in the schooling they’ve been allowed to have, or imposed upon them, there is no meaning to life afforded them, and so Diana was, in a sense, not quite that generation, but part of it, and found herself in circumstances she had not anticipated, for which she had no adequate preparation. She tried to find a purpose for her life in that process. And one must have compassion about these things, which the Queen does not. And I think the Queen’s behavior in this situation was transparently *despicable*. . . .

the weather. A less charitable interpretation was offered by one prominent American media figure, who, while watching the Queen on the TV screen, screamed out, “She’s a pit bull—she’s nothing but a pit bull!”

That “pit bull” image was further documented, in a Sept. 8 report on Britain’s Channel 4 News, by correspondent Jon Snow, on how the Queen behaved following Diana’s death. This was the lead story in the next day’s London *Guardian*, and has since been widely synopsisized by continental European papers. According to the *Guardian*: “The Queen initially demanded that Diana’s body should not be placed in any of the royal palaces, and should be taken to a private mortuary when it arrived back in Britain. . . .

“The Queen wanted a private funeral, despite Diana’s status.

“There was no mention of Diana at the morning’s service at Crathie Kirk [the church in Balmoral], because the Queen stuck to her order, that the Princess’s name should never be mentioned in front of her.

”[Prince] Charles had to ring Tony Blair from his flight from Aberdeen to Paris [in the early hours of Aug. 31], to discuss placing Diana’s body at St. James’s Palace. He also

had to ring ahead on the return flight to Northolt, because no arrangements had been made by the Palace, to lay a wreath on Diana’s coffin.”

1989 revisited?

Since Sept. 6-7, the continental European press has been brutal in its portrayal of the monarchy. In the Italian daily *Corriere della Sera* on Sept. 10, commentator Emilio Tadini, who has written some excoriating exposés on the British monarchy’s historical involvement in drug trafficking, stressed that Diana was “the heroine,” who emanated a sense of the good, in opposition to the nasty Queen, who could be described as “Snow White’s stepmother, hard, ruthless, unhuman, deliberately far from us.”

On Sept. 8, Bernard Heimrich, London correspondent for Germany’s *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, wrote that “the royal family was in danger of looking like the circular dance in the [movie] *Dance of the Vampires*, as, with the death of Diana, it had lost the one and only being of flesh and blood, which can still be visible in a mirror.”

In the German liberal daily *Frankfurter Rundschau*, senior commentator Ralf Paasch stated that “the monarchy re-

acted to the death of the unloved (to them) daughter-in-law, as the [East German Communist] Politburo reacted to the fall of the Berlin Wall” in 1989.

In the discussion with *EIR*, Brooks-Baker said he found it be a “good comparison,” to liken the monarchy’s reaction to what has been happening in Britain, to the way the East German Communist Politburo reacted to the fall of the Berlin Wall, because both cases are characterized by a complete misreading of the popular mood, even if, in his view, the situation in Britain is somewhat “less desperate” than it was in East Germany in 1989. He warned that the monarchy had better change its behavior fast, at least in the direction of “their royal cousins on the continent,” or “this throne will disappear.” A committed monarchist, he warned that, as early as one year from now, there could be a vote in Britain on the country becoming a republic, and, if current trends continue, the monarchy would lose such a referendum.

But many of “their royal cousins on the continent” are already trembling, over the shock effects of the British situation. Notably, many royal houses — from Scandinavia, Belgium, and others — abstained from attending Diana’s funeral.

Attempting to re-group

In the meantime, British influentials of various stripes are attempting to come up with options to contain the damage, and to re-coup Britain’s global imperial position at this critical point of crisis. Brooks-Baker and others are demanding that the “Prince William option” be brought into play, the idea being that Prince Charles step aside, and make room for his and Diana’s eldest son, William, now 15 years of age, as the heir to the throne. According to Brooks-Baker, this is the only way to restore this “shattered dynasty,” and to head off the danger — as he sees it — of Britain becoming a republic.

Another variant, is for Charles to step forward as the spokesman for a radically “modernized” monarchy, freed from the carry-overs of the past. This idea is popular in the Blair entourage, among Labour Party think-tanks, and within circles of the City of London, Foreign Office, and prominent British universities, such as Oxford and the London School of Economics. Indeed, over the recent period, the Prince of Wales and Blair had been forging such a close relationship, that British commentators were speaking of the “Charles and Tony Show.” Among such circles, one hears much talk about how Britain is evolving into a “Fourth Empire,” different from the more up-front forms of empire of the past, and centered around new techniques of cultural manipulation.

A third trend, might be called the “with the Windsors to the bitter end” faction, those who refuse any tinkering with the monarchical institutions, come what may. Individuals in this grouping are experiencing a case of nerves these days. One figure, in a Sept. 9 discussion with *EIR*, barked that nothing fundamental had changed in Britain, that the royals had had every right to be opposed to Diana, and that the reaction to her death among the population would have no lasting effect. He went so far as to deny that Earl Spencer had attacked

the royal family, during his Westminster Abbey funeral oration, and that the millions of Britons who lined the streets that day were not “mourners” or “grievers,” but rather, “spectators,” interested in watching a “spectacle.”

It need be watched, whether another grouping will emerge in the Establishment, that will be willing to learn the deeper lessons of the recent events, including the obvious yearning of many Britons for a better life than that brought about by the British oligarchical system, and to support the kinds of financial, political, and cultural changes outlined on scores of occasions, by LaRouche and his associates.

In the meantime, the various factions are converging on one identifiable strategy to restore Britain’s position, namely, upgrading the Commonwealth. On Oct. 24-27, the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting will take place in Edinburgh, and for the first time ever, the Queen will make a formal address to the gathering. The Blair government is throwing its full weight behind this gathering. One London strategist close to Blair commented on Sept. 10 that “the Commonwealth will rally behind the Queen.” He added, “There is more support for her in the Commonwealth, than there is in Britain.”

To the extent this Commonwealth offensive takes hold, it would also mean an escalation of global operations against the British system’s main historical adversary, the American Republic. The past days have brought to the surface numerous points of tension between the House of Windsor and its loyalists, and the United States and the American Presidency.

As reported in the Sunday *Bild am Sonntag* in Germany, President Bill Clinton became angry when the royals disinvited him from the funeral of Princess Diana. According to this report, once it had been decided that Diana would not be receiving a state funeral, Buckingham Palace communicated to President Clinton, that he should not attend, because it would set a bad precedent, and that other heads of government would also want to come. Clinton, who was personally fond of Diana, wrote back, announcing that Hillary would attend, and would do so in an “official mission.”

Hillary was among Diana’s closest friends abroad, and the President issued a statement of tribute, to both Diana and the deceased Mother Teresa, declaring that “two women of vastly different backgrounds and worlds are gone. But each in her own way, has shown us what it is live a life of meaning through concern for others. This is their great legacy. Let us honor it.”

From the British side, further injury was delivered by Donald Foreman, head of the key royalist lobby, the Monarchist League. In a letter in the *Independent* on Sept. 10, Foreman dragged out a quote from 1945 from Winston Churchill, about how Adolf Hitler had risen to power because of “American and modernizing pressures,” the which drove the Hapsburgs out of power in Austria-Hungary, and the Hohenzollerns out of power in Germany, after World War I. This created a “vacuum,” Churchill claimed, into which Hitler moved. Foreman concluded: “Let us never make the mistake of creating a vacant throne here.”