

Britain's 'Palacegate' brawl brings challenge to liberal 1960s values

by Mark Burdman

The most profound political intervention made in Great Britain in the end-of-year political season, was a declaration by the number two of the Church of England, Bishop of London Dr. Graham Leonard, criticizing the Church of England itself and other leading influentials in Britain, for having been "mesmerized" by 1960s-style "permissiveness" and for having tolerated the moral degradation of the United Kingdom.

Dr. Leonard's statement, run full-page in the *Daily Mail* Dec. 13 under the title, "AIDS, Promiscuity, and Moral Cowardice," summed up the real issue in the U.K. in 1986, a year in which Britain underwent its deepest constitutional, moral, and cultural crises in four decades.

Dr. Leonard, a co-thinker of British conservative circles close to Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, has been a factional foe, on numerous issues, of Robert Runcie, Archbishop of Canterbury, an ultra-liberal favorite of Queen Elizabeth II and the "brain-trust" at Buckingham Palace. So, when Dr. Leonard wrote, "The Church of England has let the people down," and, "We were mesmerized by the Sixties, church and people alike, and we are now reaping the fruit of the extreme permissiveness of the Sixties when people thought you did what you like and somebody else would pick up the consequences," many Britons must have seen the political fights of the past year portrayed in sharp relief.

Dr. Leonard wrote, "AIDS will also, I believe, bring the Church of England to its senses. . . . At least we can use it as a focal point for good, although at great human sacrifice. . . . There is a fundamental distinction between good and evil, between right and wrong." The message seemed to be that 1987 should be the year, in which the values of the "Permissive Society," introduced by the Harold Wilson-Roy Jenkins regime of 1964-70, will be rolled back.

Since the Wilson-Jenkins Permissive Society regime was patronized message is that 1987 will likely be the year in which the policy fights involving palace, parliament, and prime minister, will come to a head.

The year 1986 often made Britons think of 1936. It was in that year that King Edward VIII abdicated, the last British

monarch to do so.

In 1986, a war broke out between 10 Downing Street and the palace. It had been simmering for some time, if only because of the regular "New Age" pronouncements from the heir to the throne, Prince Charles, on such matters as the plight of Britain's inner cities, the state of the economy, and so on. It reached a higher level of tension when Mrs. Thatcher brought Britain into cooperation with the United States during the American military operation against Libya in April.

Then, in mid-July, it exploded.

The *Sunday Times* of London leaked unusually frank comments made by Buckingham Palace Press Secretary Sir Michael Shea, expressing Her Majesty's disfavor with Mrs. Thatcher on a number of issues, ranging from southern Africa, Libya, and attitudes on "arms control" and relations with the Soviet Union, to matters pertaining to the plight of the unemployed and Britain's miners' strike. Her Majesty, Sir Michael pointed out, was sympathetic to views of the political left.

The palace next deployed its assets in the Commonwealth, during Commonwealth "mini-summit" meetings in London in August, to confront Mrs. Thatcher over her refusal to implement sanctions against South Africa.

EIR's role in the fight

Soon, *EIR* became a protagonist in the saga. *EIR* founder Lyndon LaRouche wrote in a July 25 article, "Is Queen Elizabeth II Sinking?" that the Queen's reported statements criticizing Mrs. Thatcher on various issues, "are only the tip of the iceberg." LaRouche pinpointed a "growing resentment" within the British Establishment "against the Royal Household's increasingly pro-socialist, and pro-Soviet connections and leanings, as visible increasingly since the Harold Wilson government of the 1960s. . . . Since the Wilson government of the 1960s, the monarchy's circles have played a leading role in promoting accommodations to Moscow which seem to many insiders as a replay of Neville Chamberlain's appeasement of Hitler." British Establishment influentials were particularly aghast, he noted, about the pros-

pect of the pro-Soviet Prince Charles assuming the throne at some point in the future.

More fundamental yet, LaRouche stressed, is that these appeasement arrangements were being mediated through "the radical, pro-Soviet changes in the doctrine of the Anglican Church, as introduced under the prominent sponsorship of Archbishop Runcie." These changes violated the Act of Settlement of 1701, which binds the Windsor monarchs, as Sovereigns of the Church of England, to uphold the articles of Anglican Christianity. As long as the Queen's man, Runcie, carries out such changes, the very legitimacy of the House of Windsor would have to be challenged.

Indeed, the "LaRouche factor" in Britain became more and more controversial. The British Broadcasting Corporation, in a July television feature, highlighted LaRouche as an American figure of controversy, particularly on AIDS. Between Nov. 4 and 10, LaRouche was the subject of significant features in the Fabian Society's *New Statesman*, the *Times* of London, and the *Daily Express*, the first two quasi-objective and the latter violently hysterical and hostile.

Royal AIDS

To paraphrase Dr. Leonard, it was the issue of AIDS that began, especially in the last quarter of the year, to "bring people to their senses." It has forced a re-thinking of the predominant cultural paradigms which have ruled Britain.

In a Dec. 11 statement, James Anderton, chief constable of Greater Manchester and president of the Association of British Police Chiefs, a former Methodist lay preacher who has been in the process of converting to Roman Catholicism, declared to an AIDS seminar for British police officers that the chief factor in the spread of AIDS was moral degeneracy among people "swirling around in a human cesspit of their own making," "obnoxious sexual practices," and "our increasingly degenerate conduct as a human race." Within 48 hours of his statement, Anderton's office in Manchester had received more than 1,000 calls, close to 100% of them expressing total agreement.

The causal connection between moral degradation and the AIDS calamity cannot help but draw attention to the strange occurrences around Buckingham Palace. The Oct. 4 death from AIDS of Prince Charles' valet, Stephen Barry, several months after the death from AIDS of palace aide Lord Avon, drew ironic comments from Fleet Street about the rampant homosexuality inside the palace.

This intersected another line of investigation: the circle of friends of Princess Margaret. In September, British tabloids began to reveal details of past cocaine parties at her Kensington Palace, which occurred while her sister, the Queen, was present. Other attention was drawn to Margaret's old flame, the Duke of Marlborough, whose son, the Marquis of Blandford, was tried during 1986 for his involvement in a cocaine-trafficking ring, and who was revealed, in the course of the court proceedings, to have spent vast sums on his own cocaine habit.

Southern Africa

Fight for economic independence begins

by Thierry Lalevée

The riots which began in northern Zambia on Dec. 11 received far less international coverage than those which have happened over the year in South Africa. However, both have the same roots—the collapsing economies of the region and the drive of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) to impose total dictatorship over a weakened continent.

Zambia, like Zaire, has been following the IMF prescriptions. When President Kaunda decided on Dec. 11 to increase the price of basic commodities by 200%, the core of Zambia's industrial center, the miners, went on a general revolt. After several days of rioting, the arrest of hundreds of miners, and the death of many, Kaunda was forced to back down and withdraw the measure. An editorial of the *Financial Times*, entitled "Warning Signals from Africa," admitted he had no choice: The African countries could not be expected to implement the full measures advocated by the IMF, "unless additional resources are being provided."

As Kaunda knows, the riots have put into question much more than his embarrassed relationship with the IMF. They are questioning the development strategy of the entire region, especially the front-line states. Most are accepting IMF demands as they believe that such behavior will reinforce their calls to Western nations to impose a full economic boycott on South Africa. Most have publicly announced such a break. Zambia's riots were the result. Are they ready to sacrifice their population for such chimeras?

The only display of seriousness and sanity which should serve as a model to these countries, has been advanced by Zaire's President Mobutu whose country was branded, only a few weeks ago, as the model of what an African country could become by implementing IMF measures. In a major speech in front of the central committee of the ruling party on Oct. 30, President Mobutu made no bones on what he thought this had done to the country: utter destruction. "A country cannot sacrifice everything just to pay its external debts," he warned. "We will not alienate our sovereignty and independence." Following the example of Peru, he then announced that Zaire from now on would restrict its debt repayment to 10% of the value of its exports.

Again, an embarrassed international silence followed