

Will Queen Liz's 'Jubilee' Be Endgame for Windsors?

by Mark Burdman and Scott Thompson

The year 2002 is supposed to be the year of celebration in Britain of the 50th anniversary of Queen Elizabeth II's ascension to the throne. But rather than an occasion for celebration, the Jubilee is proving to be a true *annus horribilis* ("horrible year") for Her Majesty, the royal family, and entourage. It is turning out to be a giant flop.

Throughout the first months of 2002, there have been a slew of panicked articles in the British establishment press, that there has been no sign of excitement whatsoever among the general British population for celebrating this moment. The monarchy and the government of Prime Minister Tony Blair have been desperately trying to drum up some signs of effervescence. To add insult to injury, when it was announced that Britons would gain two extra days of work holidays during the first days of June, so they could celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Queen's coronation on June 2, the result was that an all-time record of Britons made plans for vacation, and to leave the country! *EIR* readers who may have had plans to be driving in northern France at that time, are advised to find somewhere else to go.

In an attempt to "liven things up," Blair's 10 Downing Street has announced that there is to be a big government-sponsored event to honor Her Majesty, for invited influentials, on April 29. Beyond this, all sorts of aging rock n' roll celebrities—who have been granted knighthoods to accompany their graying hair and increasingly warped voices—will be attempting to rally the masses for a spectacular "Jubilee Concert," on June 3. These include Beatle Sir Paul McCartney,

guitarist Eric Clapton, Sir Elton John, and others.

To give a sense of the mood in certain quarters of Britain, the Fabian Society—the organization founded in the early 20th Century and which has often served as the left buttock of the House of Windsor—is sponsoring an "alternative Jubilee," and is trying to bring together numerous forces who are convinced that the monarchy is an anachronism. The Fabians will be holding a mid-June conference, entitled "Whither the Monarchy?" Some wags have recommended that the title be changed, to "Wither the Monarchy?"

Multiple Embarrassments

Meanwhile, the political humiliations mount, for the House of Windsor monarchical structure.

First, Her Majesty's Prime Minister Blair, who is invested with considerable powers by the monarchy and its Privy Council, and who meets with Queen Elizabeth once every week, is faced with massive opposition, both for failed internal policies, and for his non-stop trips to various parts of the globe, in the self-imposed role of, as one caustic commentator labelled it, "President of the World."

Second, the Queen's Commonwealth, which was designed after World War II as a variant of the British Empire, has been jolted by an unprecedented crisis, over the election in Commonwealth member Zimbabwe. Although that crisis appears to have been met, for the moment, by the March 19 announcement that Zimbabwe would be suspended from the institution for one year, an immense amount of ill-feeling has been created, between the white-dominated Commonwealth countries—Britain, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia—and all the rest, with potentially devastating consequences. This occurs after the Queen herself inaugurated the latest Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting, in Australia in early March.

On that occasion she faced another embarrassment, when her racist husband, His Royal Highness The Prince Philip, who was the co-founder (with former Nazi SS intelligence member Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands) of the World Wildlife Fund (now World Wide Fund for Nature), went up to a group of Aborigines in Australia and asked, "Do you still throw spears at one another?" Luckily for him, he escaped one being thrown at him; the Aborigines' leaders, being more civilized than he, politely told him that this was not the case.



The 50th year of Elizabeth II's reign is drawing no great interest from her subjects, and like Her Majesty's Blair government, the Windsor dynasty may be sinking.

Yet another blow came with the release of a book about the late Princess Margaret, just two weeks after her death in mid-February. Entitled *Margaret, The Last Real Princess*, by Noel Botham, the book alleges that Margaret was a user of cocaine and marijuana, and recounts an incident when she visited the dressing room of the Rolling Stones rock group, and sniffed cocaine there. Margaret's son, Viscount Linley, is bringing legal action to stop the book's circulation, but news reports revealing the core allegations of the book have already spread far and wide.

The House of Windsor gets particularly nervous about such revelations—even if similar allegations have been made many times in the past. It has invested enormous effort in circulating internationally, including by Anglo-American media circuits, the slander that “Lyndon LaRouche claims that Queen Elizabeth II pushes drugs.” She does not “push them”—in the sense of a street-corner hustler—but, as the case of Princess Margaret suggests, members of the House of Windsor do use them.

The Influence of Diana

Well-informed experts on the monarchy claim that there is a deeper cause for the House of Windsor's woes. Harold Brooks-Baker, who is the chief spokesman for the monarchist *Burke's Peerage*, told *EIR* that more and more people find the House of Windsor (the world's most dysfunctional family) to be less and less relevant.

One reason for this had been the role played by Diana, who had had the misfortune of marrying the “Hare Apparent,” His Royal Highness The Prince Charles. Brooks-Baker pointed to this factor, and observed: “Diana, Princess of Wales, had had an immense influence throughout the world, so it was not bad news for the Royal Family when she died. And, their callousness at her death had an impact as well. . . . There was no room in the monarchy for Diana . . . to play the international political role that she did. . . . Princess Diana had done great harm to the popularity of the monarchy, when she posed the choice to the British subjects of choosing between her or the monarchy. . . .

“Once, the British monarchy had been viewed in semi-religious terms, and these days are now gone. The monarchy has been unable to make the transition. In particular, Princess Diana made it seem that her former husband, the Prince of Wales, was unfit to govern.”

Diana Entwistle, of the British Fabian Society, who is helping to organize its “alternative Jubilee,” told *EIR*: “The whole of British society was engaged with Diana's plight. She had become of symbol status or celebrity status. She was the Queen of Hearts, and with her death in the way that it happened, people had lost interest in the Royal Family. People do not feel engaged with the Royal Family any more.”

Unfortunately, both of these sources have perhaps deliberately overlooked that it was Diana's quest for a mission, in the footsteps of Mother Teresa, that made her so admired as a moral force, in contrast with the out-of-step British monarchy.