Editorial

Our British cousins' Queen

Since March 18, 1986, the day of the Illinois primary elections, our competitors in the mass media in the United States have insisted, for reasons of their own, on turning Queen Elizabeth into something of an American celebrity. If one is to believe the Washington Post, the New York Times, United Press International, Associated Press, NBC-TV, and their imitators, Queen Elizabeth is "that woman," who, "LaRouche says, pushes drugs."

LaRouche, of course, has never said anything of the sort. The *Post*, NBC and the others, however, keep insisting: "LaRouche says the Queen runs drugs." One wonders, what the real purpose of these detractors might be—to slight LaRouche by imputing to him wild exaggerations, or to give the Queen a bad name?

We would have let the matter drop without comment, had it not reached the mass circulation media in the United Kingdom. Recently, on the privately owned Channel Four of British television, a moderate-sized program on LaRouche's political movement in the United States was broadcast, which featured an episode between a LaRouche supporter and the British television interviewer. "Do you really think the Queen of England runs drugs?" the interviewer was shown on TV to ask. "I think the real problem is your Prince Charles trying to change our Constitution," was the LaRouche supporter's answer as seen by TV viewers in London.

Subsequently, the mass circulation, semi-pornographic newspaper the *Daily Mail*, in its May 2 edition, ran a huge slander against Mr. LaRouche and the U.S. political movement with which he is associated, accusing Mr. LaRouche of "anti-Semitism, racialism, violence and militarism," and calling the National Democratic Policy Committee a "neo-Nazi organization."

Fair though all may be, in love and war, as well as in politics which combines both, we believe our colleagues of the *Daily Mail* deserve a reprimand and a lecture in history. On the day they published their slander on Mr. LaRouche, the gentlemen of the London tabloid were also shedding burning tears over the death

of the Duchess of Windsor, wife of England's not "neo" but original "paleo-Nazi" King Edward VIII, uncle of Queen Elizabeth II. Of course, the owner of the pornographic *Daily Mail* is Lord Rothermere, a member of the British Royal family, whose daughter is married to Lord David John Ogilvy, the son of the Honorable Angus Ogilvy, husband of Princess Alexandra.

This royally married Ogilvy family, the in-laws, so to speak, of the pornographic *Daily Mail*, has long been associated with drug trade going back to the China Opium Wars, and is one of the very prominent financial powers of the Kingdom today.

There is a certain sense in which it can be said that the Queen of England is "not responsible," for policies of her country. Her peculiar circumstances are not similar to other monarchies, past or present. Since the 1701 Act of Succession, which, among other things, gave us the murder of Queen Anne and crazy George III, the British Queen, or King, is the tolerated head of a financial, titled oligarchy which specializes in conducting banking, trading, financial, and commodity and realestate operations around the globe, regardless of flag or nationality.

These people, Lord Rothermere and the Honorable Ogilvy included, have chosen the convenience of the institution of monarchy to run their business operations which, as a rule, have been conducted against the lawful interests of many nations, including the national interests of the United Kingdom. It is an unfortunate fact that since the assassination of Queen Anne, all subsequent British monarchs, the Hanoverian/Windsor family, have chosen to be part of this rapacious, disloyal financial oligarchy, which they have found most enormously profitable.

So, do not imagine the "Queen of England runs drugs" in the style of a South Bronx high-school dropout. Instead, consider the Board of Directors of Jardine Matheson, or Hong Kong & Shanghai Banking Corp. deliberating on the distribution and investment of drugtrade proceeds before they change into the proper attire for attending the next royal ball.

72 National EIR May 9, 1986