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The “mainstream media” have treated these two books as soap opera vignettes, especially in the United States, where royalty are often mistaken for their Hollywood pagentry. The truth is that both books provide an accurate reading, in the small, of the ruthless immorality of the House of Windsor, which rules the new British Empire with a velvet glove covering its iron fist. Since these books can be expected to have a mass readership, Executive Intelligence Review is taking this opportunity to provide a “reader’s guide” to them, which will hopefully help to inoculate the reader from the “virtual reality” with which they have been portrayed.

A prominent feature of how the mainstream media have sought to blunt the books’ impact, is how they selected one paragraph from Kelley’s book in order to discredit it. That paragraph was based upon a high-level source report that King George VI was impotent, which necessitated that his daughters, the future Queen Elizabeth II, and her sister Margaret, be created through artificial insemination. Interestingly, of all the media which resorted to this “micecreaping technique” (as it is known in journalism), no one had the audacious humor to ask: “If this report is true, then what species was used for the artificial insemination?”

Actually, Kelley’s book is a serious attempt to present a history of the centuries-old House of Hanover in its 20th-century incarnation as the House of Windsor. Kelley conducted more than five years of research, and, most importantly, she conducted hundreds of interviews with insiders, who provided her with a “fly-on-the-wall” viewpoint on the internal workings of the principal members of the British royal family. Although Kelley is lacking the deeper knowledge of the history and geopolitical goals of the royals, such as found in EIR’s September 1997 Special Report “The True Story behind the Fall of the House of Windsor,” she has written a damning indictment of the British royal family in its modern guise.

This is especially true in terms of Kelley’s documentation that it was not just King Edward VIII (HRH The Duke of Windsor, upon his abdication), who was a party to the House of Windsor-directed project to impose Adolf Hitler on a prostate Germany, as the marcher-lord for British geopolitical goals. Kelley provides some of the documentation to show that, among other royals, HRH The Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, had ties to the “Hitler Project.” This is most important for current affairs, because Prince Philip today is the “chief enforcer” for the informal Club of the Isles, which is the House of Windsor-affiliated rentier-financier oligarchy created by King Edward VII’s drive to initiate World War I: a geopolitical project carried out by the House of Windsor to make itself primus inter pares among the surviving monarchies of Europe. Diana, Princess of Wales, referred to this Club of the Isles as “the Mafia.” The most extensive treatment of the Club of the Isles can be found in EIR’s Special Report.

Another measure of the fact that these books are not merely soap opera, is the vicious response to them by the House of Windsor and its Club of the Isles allies. Ever since the Aug. 31 assassination of Princess Diana, the House of Windsor has been in a murderous rage. The appearance of both these books after Diana’s death—Kelley’s had already been written before her demise, and Morton’s was rushed into a second edition—helped fuel that rage. As Kelley reports in her introduction, Prince Philip, as the enforcer of what he calls “The Firm,” took the unprecedented step of twice threatening to sue the author, even before she had finished her book. Although The Royals will probably sell 2 million copies worldwide, it has effectively been banned in the United Kingdom. And, Kelley has indicated that she fears for her safety should she return there. It is no accident, as this review will highlight, that author Kitty Kelley is shown on the back cover of her book prominently waving an American flag.

Likewise, when the first edition of Andrew Morton’s Diana: Her True Story appeared in 1992, and implied that Prin-
cess Diana’s problems arose from the fact that her husband, HRH Charles, Prince of Wales, was having an adulterous relationship with a married woman, the book elicited wrathful condemnations from the lackeys at Buckingham Palace, the prime minister, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and other quarters from within the Club of the Isles. The edition that appeared shortly after Princess Diana’s assassination, which publicly revealed Diana’s direct role in all phases of the book’s first edition, provoked Prince Charles to blurt out that Morton was being “callous,” even though Prince Charles had already admitted on nationwide TV, in front of his children, that he had, in fact, been carrying on a protracted affair with Mrs. Camilla Parker-Bowles, while both were still married.

The House of Windsor has good reason to be worried about these two books, as well as many others on Princess Diana, that are now in the works. By the time that Princess Diana had finished her humiliation of the decadent House of Windsor, with the assistance of various factions within the Club of the Isles, the House of Windsor was on the ropes. As Kelley points out in her book, written before the assassination of Princess Diana, even at that time, between two-thirds and three-quarters of the British public thought that Prince Charles was unsuitable to become King. And, many of these subjects agreed with Princess Diana, that Charles should be skipped over in the line of succession, in favor of their eldest son, Prince William.

After Diana’s assassination, polls suggested that the House of Windsor itself might fall. A new poll of a sample of 1,108 people within the United Kingdom, which was published in the Daily Mail, showed that most Britons believed that Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II should step down and hand the crown to a successor, rather than reign until her death. Only 24% of the people sampled in the U.K. thought that Queen Elizabeth II should rule until her death. Meanwhile, the antipathy to Queen Elizabeth’s heir apparent, Prince Charles, remained the same. The poll showed deep divides over who should succeed Queen Elizabeth II, ranging from the Queen’s grandson, Prince William, to her daughter, Princess Anne; some responses to the poll indicated a marked growth in republicanism.

It is important to bear in mind that, although Britain has only briefly been ruled without a royal sovereign, there have been numerous changes in the dynasty that ruled. It is just such concerns that have caused the British royal family to lash out at the two books being reviewed here.

‘The Fall of the Eagles’

The Royals begins with a description of the utter ruthlessness into which the House of Hanover had fallen during the reign of King George V (1910-36). It was during his reign that the British royal family perpetuated the policy of his predecessor, King Edward VII (1901-10), to induce Germany into fighting a two-front war, with its defeat to be followed by the even more ruinous Versailles Peace Treaty. This policy of luring the British royal cousin, Kaiser Wilhelm, into World War I, proved disastrous for King George V’s Hohenzollern relatives, who were overthrown at the conclusion of the conflict.

Kelley does not develop the reasons for World War I, which, among others, had as a major goal destroying Germany, because, despite the oligarchic policies of the Kaiser, the nation had become a global scientific, technological, and industrial power on the American System model, rivalling Britain’s hegemony.

World War I also saw the collapse of the British royal family’s relatives who ruled in Russia, not only because Russia had been prostrated by the war, but because of active support by the British Secret Intelligence Service for the Bolsheviks, through the agency of what some call “The Trust”: a story that has been documented by EIR. As Kelley points out, although King George V could have saved his cousins in the family of Tsar Nicholas Romanov, through only a minor military exercise, he refused to lift a finger in answer to their pleas. This emboldened the Bolsheviks to execute the Tsar and his immediate family at Yekaterinburg.

Thus, through the British royal family’s successful orchestration of World War I, there was accomplished the goal of toppling “the Eagles,” or rival empires and their imperial families, leaving the British Empire primus inter pares.

However, because the royal family had so successfully nurtured British public hatred of Germany, King George V had to make some cosmetic changes to deter the very public animosity that he had helped engender, from his own German family. One public relations measure was to Anglicize the name of the ruling House of Hanover, which had become the House of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha under Queen Victoria, changing it to the House of Windsor, as we have it today. The same chameleon trick was applied on King George V’s relative, Prince Battenberg, who as Admiral of the Fleet had mobilized Britain’s Navy before the outbreak of war. But, because of his German oligarchical roots, Prince Battenberg was forced to resign his post upon the outbreak of hostilities, and take the Anglicized family name of Mountbatten, while assuming the British title of the First Marquess of Milford Haven.

One of the ironies that Kelley points to, is that, when George V, who had taken so many ruthless steps on behalf of the British Empire, was lingering near death, his doctor injected him with a lethal dose of cocaine and heroin, so that the announcement of the King’s death would meet a public relations opportunity, is a fact of royal life to which Kelley persistently returns throughout her book, especially the repertoire of royal pageantry that the House of Windsor brings to bear, even to the present day, including, as we shall see below, “the fairytale wedding” of Princess Diana and Prince Charles.

The Hitler Project

Kelley also identifies two crucial features of the House of Windsor’s direct involvement in the British geopolitical
project to impose Adolf Hitler upon Germany, as a marcher lord to conduct the Drang nach Osten (“drive to the East”) into the Soviet heartland, thus seeking to accomplish the dual goal of destroying both Germany and the Soviet Union.

First, Kelley identifies the pro-Nazi sentiments of George V’s successor, King Edward VIII, who was forced to abdicate in 1936—the same year he assumed the throne. It is a soap opera myth that the reason for Edward VIII’s abdication was to marry his “true love,” the twice-divorced American, Wallis Simpson. Actually, King Edward VIII’s abdication represented a cold coup d’état by a faction of the Club of the Isles, which had come to see Hitler as an uncontrollable Frankenstein’s monster. Kelley notes that Edward, who assumed the title HRH The Duke of Windsor upon his abdication, entered into negotiations with Adolf Hitler, who was then considering an invasion of the United Kingdom and who offered to restate the Duke and Duchess of Windsor upon the British throne as puppet monarchs.

Kelley mistakenly reports that Hitler had planned to kidnap the Duke and Duchess of Windsor. Actually, newly released archive reports show that both were willing parties to the scheme during negotiations in Spain and Portugal, and that kidnapping was only to be a last resort. It was because of these negotiations, which were discovered by British SIS, that Prime Minister Sir Winston Churchill had the Duke and Duchess hastily dispatched to the Bahamas, where the Duke was assigned the token post of Governor General and was kept under close watch by both Churchill and President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Most importantly, Kelley states that relevant documents in this affair are kept by The Queen Mother Queen Elizabeth (i.e., Queen Elizabeth II’s mother), who has sole access to them in her vault at Clarence House. Kelley’s naming of The Queen Mother as the custodian of these secrets is long past due, since the “Queen Mum” is worshipped by Britain’s subjects. Until The Royals, there had been no hint of the hypocrisy displayed by The Queen Mother, who is revered for giving enough spine to her weak husband, King George VI (1936-52), to stay in London during the Nazi bombing blitz, in order to be close to the subjects he sought to mobilize against the very enemy his brother, the Duke of Windsor, had helped to create.

Moreover, Kelley notes that within the space of nine months in 1930, Prince Philip’s four older sisters each married members of the German aristocracy, all of whom were active supporters of Adolf Hitler. One of Philip’s uncles-in-law by these marriages became a colonel in Himmler’s SS, while brother-in-law Prince Christoph of Hesse became head of the secret electronic eavesdropping office in Goering’s research office (the Forschungsamt), which eventually became the Gestapo. Until his death in 1943, Prince Christoph of Hesse was responsible not only for important features of the SS destruction of the SA, but for the arrest, torture, and eventual extermination of innumerable opponents of the Third Reich.

As for Prince Philip’s namesake, Prince Philip of Hesse, he became Hitler’s personal messenger and was so effective that he was made an honorary general in the Storm Troopers.

Kelley understates the importance of Prince Philip’s schooling in Nazi Germany at the Schloss Salem school of Kurt Hahn, as being merely a combination of cold showers and rigorous exercise. As EIR documents in its Special Report, in the chapter on “The Nazi Roots of the House of Windsor,” Hahn, though part-Jewish, was a “universal” or “Musso- lini-style” fascist, similar to Zionist fanatic Vladimir Jabotinsky. By the time Prince Philip’s pro-Nazi sister Theodora had arranged for him to come from Britain to attend Schloss Salem, the SS had arrested Hahn, and the original rigors of the “strength through joy” curriculum of the school had been transformed by a hefty contribution of Nazi “race science.” Prince Philip returned to Britain after a year at Schloss Salem, and his only public reference to his education there was that he had “gotten tired of goose-stepping.”

Already, by this time, a faction of the Club of the Isles had not only rescued Kurt Hahn from a Nazi jail, but had given him the funds to establish Gordonstoun School in Britain. On his return to Britain, Prince Philip finished his schooling at
Gordonstoun, and he later insisted that his three sons—in-cluding the heir apparent, Prince Charles—be trained there under Hahn. While Philip was at Gordonstoun, Hahn was lobbying members of the Club of the Isles, that they could profitably form an alliance with the “moderate center” of the Nazi Party.

Kelley is wrong when she says that Lord Louis Mountbat-ten discouraged the House of Windsor and Prince Philip from corresponding with their pro-Nazi relatives in Germany. In fact, it was Lord Louis Mountbatten who became one of their most important back-channels, through his sister Louise, the crown princess of pro-Nazi Sweden. Moreover, Prince Philip developed secretive ties to the Duke of Windsor, who used this same back-channel from his post in exile.

After World War II, King George VI sent MI-5 agent Anthony Blunt on a mission to collect this secret correspon-dence, which was clearly more than just birthday cards and Christmas greetings. Presumably, much of this correspon-dence, too, is now locked away in the vault of The Queen Mother. However, American GIs beat the British to Prince Christoph of Hesse’s Kronberg Castle, where they discovered some of the correspondence hidden in the basement; King George VI subsequently pressured U.S. President Dwight Eisen-hower into extending the top secret classification of these documents indefinitely. The cover-up has continued.

As EIR Founding Editor Lyndon H. LaRouche was the first to charge, Anthony Blunt was not a Soviet “double agent,” as alleged for public consumption, but, like H.A.R. “Kim” Philby and others, he was a British “triple agent.” This explains why Queen Elizabeth II, upon being informed by her Security Services that Blunt was suspected of being a Soviet agent, provided Blunt with protection by making him Keeper of the Queen’s Pictures, and even dubbed him a Knight of the British Empire, which is given for a lifetime of service to the British Empire. Only when the mistaken identification of Blunt as a Soviet “double agent” was leaked to the press, did Queen Elizabeth II cut him loose. However, she ordered that during his subsequent interrogation, there must be no ques-tioning pertaining to Blunt’s trip to Germany to pick up the House of Windsor’s correspondence with their pro-Nazi rela-tives. This secret, kept by Queen Elizabeth II and her mother, was not to be known even to Her Majesty’s Secret Service.

It was not until well into the Cold War, in 1965, that Queen Elizabeth II became the first British sovereign to visit Germany since the 1913 trip by her grandfather, King George V, to see relatives. The purpose of the Queen’s visit was to consolidate Germany’s role as the anvil in the event of World War III. “The tragic period is over,” said Queen Elizabeth II. “If we wish to preserve the best of our great heritage, we must make common cause. . . . It is now our task to defend civilization in freedom and peace together.” German newspapers published the family tree of Queen Elizabeth and Prince Philip, which showed that they had 400 relatives living in Germany, including Hanovers, Hohenzollerns, Brunswicks, and Glucksburgs, all of whom dusted off their old decorations to celebrate the visit. As EIR has documented, these German aristocratic relatives of the House of Windsor are a major oligarchical problem impeding Germany’s full return to the American System values of scientific progress and development embodied by Friedrich List.

How to breed a pit bull

Elizabeth’s true bloodline aside, Kelley gives an excellent inside view of why even many of the Queen’s staunchest supporters say she is “extremely stupid.” Raised with full knowledge of the immense power she would someday wield, Queen Elizabeth II had no formal schooling, except for daily tutorials in British history and heraldry. She mastered the hereditary peerage and all its complex titles and bloodlines, but she had no understanding of science, mathematics, or Classical culture. Kelley cites one embarrassing example:

“Outside the Palace, Elizabeth felt self-conscious about the gaps in her education. She once asked if Dante was a horse, because she had never heard of the medieval poet.

‘No, no, he isn’t a horse,’ was the reply.

‘Is he a jockey, then?’ she asked.

“She blushed when told that Dante Alighieri was the Italian classicist who wrote The Divine Comedy, a masterpiece of world literature. Horses were what she knew best.”

But, the young Elizabeth knew her prerogative rights and power. One of her favorite games was to walk back and forth in front of the Palace guards, so that they would snap to attention and salute her. As a young princess, she once terrorized an American who had been asked to visit the King, her father. The hapless American had made the mistake of saying, as he passed young Elizabeth, “Hello cutie.” Elizabeth snarled back like a pit bull, commanding: “Bow, boy, bow!”

Another significant contribution of The Royals is Kelley’s documentation of how Prince Philip, whom George VI had not wanted as his daughter’s future royal consort, was made the chief enforcer of the Club of the Isles, by his wife, Queen Elizabeth II. The marriage between Philip and Princess Eliza-beth, heir presumptive, had been arranged by his uncle, Lord Louis Mountbatten, despite the opposition from King George VI, who only gave Philip Mountbatten the lowly title of Duke of Edinburgh prior to the marriage. However, the marriage went smoothly, until Elizabeth succeeded to throne in 1952, at which time she exerted her new powers even toward her husband, who, at one point exclaimed: “I’m just a bloody amoeba.” Again, it was Lord Mountbatten who intervened, suggesting that the Duke of Edinburgh “sow his wild oats” during an extended cruise on the royal yacht Britannia. Kelley wisely does not estimate how many illegitimate children the discreet Duke of Edinburgh sired from this point onward, although she was offered evidence of some, at a price.

On the Duke of Edinburgh’s return, a modus vivendi was worked out with Queen Elizabeth II, who raised him to the rank of a royal prince and gave him precedence over all the aristocracy, second only to herself. She also gave him the highest ranks within the Royal Navy, Air Force, and Marines,
thereby gratuitously satisfying his desire to pursue a military career. Thus, it was Queen Elizabeth II herself who made her royal consort the chief enforcer within the Club of the Isles.

*The Royals* is filled with quotes in which Prince Philip displays his murderousness, similar to his oft-repeated quote that appears in *EIR’s Special Report* “The True Story behind the Fall of the House of Windsor”: “In the event that I am reincarnated, I would like to return as a deadly virus, in order to contribute something to solve overpopulation.” Truly, the royal consort has dropped to a level of brutality beneath that of his jack-booted, pro-Nazi relatives.

It is interesting, however, that although Queen Elizabeth showered her husband with titles and positions of power within the informal Club of the Isles, she has jealously guarded him from access to “the boxes,” that contain secret documents from every branch of Her Majesty’s Government. She shares these secrets only with The Queen Mother.

In terms of her relationship with the United States, Kelley reports that Queen Elizabeth II found Harry Truman her favorite President. That the Queen would pick this gutter politician as the best, was perhaps best explained by Sir Henry Kissinger, in his May 10, 1982 speech at the Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House), where Sir Henry approvingly pointed out that Truman—unlike his predecessor, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt—oversaw the beginnings of secret arrangements between the United States and Britain, as epitomized by the dealings of Secretary of State Jimmy Byrnes.

Again, it is not surprising to discover in *The Royals*, that Queen Elizabeth II hated President John F. Kennedy and his wife, Jackie. The particular vignette presented by Kelley is how the Queen snubbed Jackie, shortly after the First Lady’s trip to France, where President Charles de Gaulle had used her to establish close relations with the United States, as opposed to the Franco-British Entente Cordiale, such as that fostered more recently by French Presidents Mitterrand and Chirac. As the editors of *EIR* documented at length in the bestselling book *Dope, Inc.*., it was the Club of the Isles, acting through its Permindex Corporation front, that initiated some 20 assassination attempts against President de Gaulle, and that succeeded in assassinating President John F. Kennedy. *Dope, Inc.* documents that one of the chief figures within the Permindex “Murder, Inc.” capacity was a Canadian, the late Maj. Louis Mortimer Bloomfield of Toronto, who was a founding member of the 1001 Club established by Prince Philip and former Nazi SS officer, HRH Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands, which is used to fund the World Wide Fund for Nature and allied eco-terrorist operations.

Kelley writes that Queen Elizabeth II’s favorite prime minister was Sir Winston Churchill, whom she made her first Garter Knight. Kelley correctly identifies the conflicts between the Queen and Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. The latter tended to view the Commonwealth as “a bunch of beggars,” while it was under Queen Elizabeth II’s reign that there was the greatest number of former colonies brought into this new British Empire. While she was prime minister, Thatcher also tended to place greater emphasis upon the “special relationship” with the United States. Thus, when President Ronald Reagan ordered the invasion of Commonwealth-member Grenada (whose sovereign is Queen Elizabeth) to protect Americans from terrorists, who were using the island as a base, Thatcher did nothing to dissuade the American action. Queen Elizabeth II was so angry at this U.S. action against a Commonwealth member that, at the next weekly audience with her prime minister, she had all the chairs removed from the room, so that Thatcher had to stand throughout the ensuing interrogation.

But, Kelley suggests that there was no difference between Queen Elizabeth II and her prime minister on asserting the rigors of Adam Smith-style “free trade” and austerity policies, to facilitate economic and financial looting operations. Queen Elizabeth II had been the most travelled sovereign in British history, visiting the farthest reaches of her Commonwealth empire. But, as Kelley points out, Queen Elizabeth II believes that the most important trip she ever took was to the Soviet Union, when Mikhail Gorbachev was President, where the Queen sought to install the very British liberal “economic reform” policies that had devastated the U.K.

It would be interesting to know whether, before this trip, the Queen consulted the frequent contributor to House of Windsor causes, namely, “Trust agent” Armand Hammer, who is known to have who promoted Gorbachev’s future leadership with KGB chief turned Soviet General Secretary Yuri Andropov. Hammer, who was introduced to Prince Charles by Lord Louis Mountbatten, and has been sometimes described as the Prince’s guru after Mountbatten’s death, was certainly close enough to the House of Windsor to serve in this role.

**The last Viceroy of India**

Lord Louis Mountbatten is a significant figure in the Club of the Isles for two reasons. First, not only had he been the matchmaker for Philip Mountbatten’s marriage to the future Queen Elizabeth II, but he served as a father-figure to both Prince Philip and his son, Charles—or, at least until Mountbatten began to promote the idea that Queen Elizabeth II might abdicate in favor of Prince Charles, before Charles became too old to reign under his, Mountbatten’s, influence.

Second, Mountbatten, as the last Viceroy of India, designed the bloody “divide and conquer” partitioning of this “crown jewel” colony into the two, rival Commonwealth countries of Muslim Pakistan and Hindu India, which led almost immediately to the spilling of more blood in the 1947 war between the two states. Although the press attacked Queen Elizabeth II for her visit to Pakistan and India on the 50th anniversary of their independence, spokesmen for Buckingham Palace told *EIR* that Foreign Secretary Robin Cook’s inflaming of the Kashmir issue is a continuation of Lord Louis Mountbatten’s policy. It was Lord Mountbatten who deliberately left the question of Kashmir, which had a Hindu ruling family with a predominantly Muslim population, unresolved,
so that it would be a running sore between India and Pakistan.

Earl Louis Mountbatten was the younger brother of George, the 2nd Marquess of Milford Haven, whose father, Prince Louis Battenberg, had Anglicized the family name to rid it of the taint of “German-ness.” Prince Philip, beginning at age ten, was raised by his Mountbatten relatives, who represent one of the kinkiest families within the Club of the Isles. As Kelley notes, the 2nd Marquess of Milford Haven had one of the largest selections of pornography ever collected, including Marquis de Sade-style sadism, incest, homosexuality, bestialism. Part of this collection ended up in the British Museum, when George died of cancer at the age of 46, and the task of raising Prince Philip was passed to Lord Louis Mountbatten, who was also a raving pervert. Author Charles Higham, in *Elizabeth and Philip*, describes Lord Louis Mountbatten being spotted, dressed in black leather and riding a horse beside his mistress, who was similarly dressed, while the two flagellated one another. Lord Louis Mountbatten’s wife, Edwina (heiress of one of the leading Hofjuden bankers to King Edward VII), was practicing bisexuality.

This scatological history of the Mountbatten’s is important, because Lord Louis Mountbatten helped raise Prince Philip and became the closest friend and adviser to Prince Charles. It was at Mountbatten’s urging that Prince Philip wrested a concession from Queen Elizabeth II, that all future members of the House of Windsor would be known as the House of Windsor-Mountbatten. And, at the time that Lord Louis Mountbatten was blown up on his yacht in 1979, Kelley also reports that he was scheming to wed his daughter, Patricia Edwina Victoria Knatchbull, Countess Mountbatten of Burma, to Prince Charles. It is most intriguing that Prince Philip verbally abused Prince Charles, for expressing his grief at Lord Mountbatten’s explosive end. Certain well-informed sources have suggested that Prince Philip’s indifference to the death of the uncle who had helped raise him bears examination, especially given Prince Philip’s murderous role as chief enforcer of the Club of the Isles.

**The Spencers: a different barony in the Club**

It was a truthful statement, when Lady Diana was told by her father, the Eighth Earl Edward John “Johnny” Spencer, that she would be “marrying down,” if she married the heir apparent, Prince Charles. It is unfortunate that Kelley’s history of the Spencer family only covers the last two generations. Lady Diana was descended through five lines of ancestral Spencers to illegitimate children of King Charles II (reigned 1660-85), who converted to Catholicism at the last moment. And, she was descended through an illegitimate daughter of Charles II’s successor, King James I (reigned 1685-88), who had begun to re-found a Catholic dynasty in England, when he was deposed in a war between his forces and those adherents of the Church of England, who brought in King William III of the House of Orange. Since King James I never abdicated, there was a line of the Stuart Dynasty, that proclaimed themselves to be Kings-in-exile. As a student, Lady Diana was fascinated by the history of the Tudor and the Stuart dynasties.

Not only did Lady Diana descend from an older dynasty than Prince Charles, but the Spencer family had intimate knowledge over the centuries of House of Hanover in its various incarnations. Lady Diana’s namesake had been promoted as a potential wife for the Prince of Wales at the beginning of the 18th century. This matchmaking was done by Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, wife of the first Duke, who defeated Louis XIV’s forces at Blenheim, Bavaria, and was a forebear of Sir Winston Churchill. The Duchess of Marlborough offered a huge dowry for her granddaughter, Lady Diana, to marry the destitute and willing Prince of Wales. However, Parliament blocked the marriage. The Spencer family remained intimately tied to the House of Hanover’s heirs down to the present.

Lady Diana’s father, the Earl Spencer, had served as equerry, first to King George VI, then to Queen Elizabeth II, becoming close to both. So, Lady Diana’s father knew whereof he spoke, when he warned his daughter against marrying the Prince of Wales. One of the most important lessons that her father taught Lady Diana, was that, regardless of her title and privileged position, all human beings were her equal: a thought that was anathema to the House of Windsor. It was Lady Diana’s father who first introduced her to Emam “Dodi” Fayed’s father, Mohamed al-Fayed, to assist her in her charity work, at a time when, as Mohamed al-Fayed complained, the rest of the British establishment were treating him “like a nigger.”

Apart from the fact that Prince Charles had employed the specious right of droit du seigneur to carry on an adulterous relationship with the wife of Andrew Parker-Bowles, the difference in religious and dynastic background between Charles and Diana, was a major cause of tension between them, even from the start of their honeymoon. As Kelley reports, the House of Windsor is rampant with “New Age” heresies. Through the influence of Lord Louis Mountbatten, Prince Charles had become absorbed in the work of the gnostic psychiatrist, Carl Jung, who had served as president of the German Medical Society for Psychotherapy when Hitler assumed power in 1933. While Jung was in this post, Hitler began the practice of euthanizing the retarded and mentally ill, as a precursor to the Holocaust. In particular, Prince Charles was taken by the work of one of Jung’s protégés, Laurens van der Post, who became the Prince’s “psychic” adviser. Van der Post, a South African, had applied Jung’s gnostic method to the interpretation of the dreams and rituals of South African bushmen.

On their honeymoon, Prince Charles came aboard the royal yacht Britannia, carrying dozens of books by Jung and van der Post, and tried to brainwash Princess Diana with their gnostic doctrines. Later, when the combination of Charles’s adultery and his family’s brutality toward her began to create mental distress, Prince Charles went so far as to bring in Laurens van der Post to psychoanalyze her. Kelley points out that van der Post did not have the slightest idea what made
Princess Diana tick. However, it was through Prince Charles’s gnostic influence that Princess Diana briefly succumbed to the Windsors’ New Age bent toward psychics, spiritualists, and so forth.

In contrast with the Windsors, Lady Diana had sought a mission in caring for those less fortunate, from the time she was in high school. The way that Princess Diana saved herself from being overcome by the New Age quirks of the Windsors, was to seek an ally in the Catholic Church.

A spokesman for Bishops’ House confirmed to EIR, that Princess Diana’s quest for a mission, after separating from Prince Charles, included collaboration with Cardinal Basil Home, with whom she visited AIDS patients, hospices for the terminally ill, and other unfortunate people, bringing them love and warmth. However, after she first made contact with Mother Teresa of Calcutta, flying to the nun’s bedside when she was sick in Rome, Prince Charles went into a tirade on her return. Nonetheless, Princess Diana was stubborn in maintaining contact with Mother Teresa, and the nun took her under her wing and encouraged her to search for a mission on behalf of mankind. The British press reported at this time that the Princess of Wales was considering converting to Catholicism. Whether or not this is true, Princess Diana’s mother, Frances Shand Kydd, whom Diana loved, did convert to Catholicism within the year prior to her daughter’s assassination.

It was this background that led Princess Diana to insist, over objections from the House of Windsor, that her children, Princes William and Harry, be raised to have concern for the plight of those who were victims of illness, poverty, and injustice. The fact that this aspect of rearing the royal children should represent a bold challenge to the House of Windsor, was one of the most striking features of the eulogy delivered by Diana’s brother, the Earl Charles Spencer, at her funeral.

‘Her True Story’

Andrew Morton’s book, Diana: Her True Story, is significantly different from Kelley’s. Its importance lies in the fact that Princess Diana chose this nondescript royal reporter to act as a vehicle for the “War of the Roses” that had erupted between herself and the House of Windsor. As we shall see, Morton has not even been a Diana loyalist, despite the fact that her choosing him to destroy the sham of the “fairy tale marriage” had made him millions of dollars. Princess Diana turned to Morton in 1992 at the suggestion of friends, as the means to explain why the House of Windsor was the primary cause of her mental distress. She feared that the royal family would declare her insane and have her children taken from her. And, Prince Charles was stoking her suspicions, by telling all his friends that Diana was “mad, mad, mad.” It is now known that Princess Diana not only provided Morton with taped answers to his questions (which were brought to her by a mutual friend, who had agreed to act as a “cutout,” to protect Diana), but that she actually edited the first edition of the book.

Most of Morton’s book focusses on the effect upon Princess Diana, of her knowledge that her husband was carrying on an adulterous affair, and did not really love her. Even during their courtship, Lady Diana discovered that Prince Charles was involved with the horse-faced Camilla Parker-Bowles. It has been said that Prince Charles and Camilla selected Lady Diana, because they thought she was so naive, that they could continue their relationship unimpeded. What is definitely true, is that Lady Diana was the “sacrificial virgin,” with no embarrassing past, who could provide an heir for the House of Windsor—something that Camilla Parker-Bowles could not do, because she would have had to divorce her compliant husband.

While, initially, Lady Diana may have been naive, once she was married to Prince Charles, his flagrant behavior with Parker-Bowles became thoroughly unacceptable to Princess Diana. After bearing an “heir and a spare” (Princes William and Harry, respectively), Princess Diana lost whatever love she had for her kookish, “New Age” husband. With the couple’s separation, a “War of the Roses” broke out between the House of Windsor and Princess Diana, who stated that she would not live a lie by perpetuating the myth of a “fairy tale marriage.” Significantly, it was Prince Philip, enforcer for what Diana called “the Mafia,” who briefly postponed the official separation by firing off brutal, threatening letters to her. Prince Philip insisted that she maintain the charade on behalf of what he called “the Firm.”

The official separation, which was announced to Parliament by Prime Minister John Major, was—even more than the fire at Windsor Castle—what lay behind Queen Elizabeth II’s reference to 1992 as her Anus Horribilis. Apart from providing more insight into Princess Diana’s search for a mission, there is little more to be found in Andrew Morton’s book. Princess Diana was angry at both him and his publisher, John O’Mara, because they refused to state for a fact in the first edition that Prince Charles had been committing adultery, because of fear of retaliation from Buckingham Palace, although Princess Diana had gone to the length of pilfering love letters that proved it.

Morton must be said to have shown little loyalty to the Princess. When he learned that Princess Diana had apparently fallen in love with Dodi Fayed (whose father, Mohamed al-Fayed, had been denied British citizenship, because he was a “wog”), the racist Morton wrote of Princess Diana: “It is no wonder your husband talks to plants, because you are a fruit.” Morton further admits to having sought to turn Princess Diana’s friends, whom she had introduced him to, against her, for what he saw as her misalliance.

When, in the aftermath of her murder, Morton decided to print excerpts from his taped interviews in the second edition, Diana: Her True Story—In Her Own Words, this cowardly opportunist, writing his concluding chapter about her death, nonetheless refused to raise a single question about the French government cover-up of the assassination. His cowardice is compounded by the fact that overwhelming evidence on the cover-up of the murder has been supplied to his publisher, John O’Mara, in the hope that Morton and O’Mara would
have some interest in publishing the truth.

Instead, O’Mara’s assistant told EIR, that not only will the firm not question the French cover-up, but that the firm will not be publishing anything more on Princess Diana for the foreseeable future. It is no wonder that Earl Charles Spencer is suing Morton and O’Mara for property rights to Princess Diana’s taped answers that were used in the compilation of both books.

War of the Roses

Nonetheless, the suggestion that Prince Charles had caused his wife mental anguish by his unrepentant adultery, as described in the first edition of Diana, Her True Story, created a firestorm. Initially, Princess Diana, as Kelley reports, had been able to avoid suspicion that she had had a principal role in orchestrating Morton’s book. However, as soon as the book appeared, Princess Diana was placed under surveillance by elements of Her Majesty’s Secret Service. It did not take long for the Queen to be informed, as a result of this surveillance, of her daughter-in-law’s hand in the book.

At this point, the House of Windsor declared a “War of the Roses” against Princess Diana. Kelley reports that it was the Queen Mother who first “unleashed her dogs” by having her lackeys plant stories to discredit Princess Diana in major media such as the London Times.

Prince Charles made a pathetic attempt to counter the effect of the Morton book, by hiring the public relations man, Jonathan Dimbleby. On a TV program broadcast throughout the United Kingdom, Charles confessed to committing adultery. And, when he was asked whether this would affect his ability as King and head of the Church of England to be Defender of the Faith, the gnostic Prince responded that he would be a defender of “all faiths.” Next, with Dimbleby’s help, he assisted in producing a biography, in which he sought sympathy on the grounds that his mother had abandoned him as a child and his father had brutalized him, especially by making him attend Gordonstoun. When Queen Elizabeth II and her royal consort became aware of these projects, Prince Philip berated Charles for setting a new low in stupidity.

A senior British intelligence officer informed EIR that some of the more damaging character assassination leaks to the press against Princess Diana were arranged through Cheltenham GCHQ, the British electronic eavesdropping counterpart of the U.S. National Security Agency. GCHQ has a unit whose ostensible purpose is to monitor all phone calls by the royals, to keep them from being ensnared by bad eggs or terrorists. On at least one occasion, purportedly verbatim transcripts of a telephone call between Diana and an alleged lover who called her “Squidgy,” were leaked to the press.

In 1995, Princess Diana, by then separated from Charles, counterattacked by arranging a TV interview with BBC’s “Panorama” program, which was kept a secret from Buckingham Palace. In the interview, she said of Charles: “Because I know the character, I would think that [being King] would bring enormous limitations to him, and I don’t know whether he could adapt to that.” She implied that he should be skipped over in the line of succession, and the crown should pass to their son, Prince William.

Elizabeth was incensed by the broadcast. Not only did she proclaim that henceforth BBC would no longer have exclusive rights to broadcast her speeches to the British Empire, but Diana’s challenge to the succession of the House of Windsor brought Queen Elizabeth II to insist upon a divorce between her son and Diana. According to Kelley, it was Prince Philip, “the enforcer,” who insisted that Princess Diana be thrown out of the family “Firm” by removing her royal family title, Her Royal Highness.

Without the protection her title afforded her as a member of the royal family, Kelley points out, the press and paparazzi became hyenas who hounded the Princess unrelentingly. Writes Kelley: “The loss showed itself within days. Her once respectful press corps turned snippy. Photographers still showed up in full force to cover her because she remained the most famous woman in the world. But they started acting like hooligans.”

In fact, paparazzi once drove Princess Diana off the road, and she had to obtain an injunction against another, who had a criminal record, who kept ramming his motorcycle into her car.

It was around this time that Princess Diana told her friends, “One day I am going to go up in a helicopter and it will just blow up.”

Apparantly, the physical surveillance of Princess Diana, which had started after the publication of Diana, Her True Story, continued. Several sources insist that the press, including the paparazzi, were informed of Princess Diana’s itinerary by Her Majesty’s Secret Service, so that they would hound her.

At the same time, the House of Windsor made sure that no member of the Royal Protection Unit would become loyal to Diana. In fact, Kelley reports that Princess Diana believed that MI-5 had staged the “accidental” vehicular homicide of one bodyguard, Barry Mannakee, whom the Palace had fired because she had confided in him, after Prince Charles flew into a rage over their closeness.

The character assassination and security stripping against her created the perfect conditions in which to stage her assassination on the night of Aug. 31 in the Place de l’Alma tunnel in Paris.

The Way Ahead Group

Ever since Prime Minister Tony Blair proclaimed the assassinated Princess of Wales to be the “people’s princess,” when her body was returned from Paris, there has been a large-scale “damage control” effort by factions of the Club of the Isles to save the House of Windsor. Blair, who was groomed for his role as prime minister through Queen Elizabeth II’s Privy Council, began this process by telling the Queen that unless she put on a reasonable show of mourning
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for Princess Diana, there might be a revolution. Prince Philip, with his usual bluntness, was heard to say, of the people queuing up to deliver flowers, “I can hear the rumble of the approaching guillotine.”

At the same time that Blair insisted on expanding the funeral ceremony for the slain Princess, he also came out to say that he was sure that Prince Charles was fit to succeed his mother: something that Princess Diana considered anathema.

It is within this crisis that the recommendations of “the Firm’s” Way Ahead Group, reported on at the end of The Royals, come into play. The Way Ahead Group is composed of the immediate British royal family, together with advisers who are selected as needed, and it meets twice a year at Balmoral Castle. Among the “planks” of the Way Ahead Group that Kelley mentions, are:

- Ending the Civil List payments of approximately $14 million in taxpayer money in exchange for a return of the Crown Estates, which had been surrendered to Parliament by King George III in 1760. The Crown Estates consist of 300,000 acres of prime London real estate, whose rents and revenues produce more than $100 million a year. Thus, the House of Windsor could say that they no longer receive taxpayer monies to support their lifestyles, although there are numerous other “entitlements” for the dysfunctional Windsor family from other taxpayer sources than the Civil List living stipend.

- Ending the 11th-century rule of primogeniture, allowing women to have equal right to succeed to the throne.
- Limiting the distribution of the title His (Her) Royal Highness to the monarch, the consort, their children, and those grandchildren who are direct heirs to the throne, thereby eliminating the title for aunts, uncles, or cousins.
- Since Prince Charles had said in the Dimbleby interview that he did not wish to be Defender of the Faith, an opening had been created for Parliament to block his succession to the throne under the 1771 Act of Settlement, which said that only a Protestant could become heir and that the monarch’s consort must also be Protestant. Under the Act of Settlement, the sovereign must swear to uphold the established Church of England and Church of Scotland, but Prince Charles was not in communion with either church. So, the Way Ahead Group proposed separating the monarchy from the strictures of religion and dissolving the theocratic bonds of church and state.

With Diana, Princess of Wales, conveniently removed, assassinated by perpetrators unknown, Prince Charles has felt more confident about soldiering on until he attains the throne. Kitty Kelley quotes him as saying: “I have dedicated myself to putting the great back into Britain, and that’s what I intend to do.” Prince Charles, like the heir of other British dynasties, may yet fully realize that his would-be subjects do not want him to be King.