



THE BRITISH CROWN

A dominion upon which the sun never sets. The Pax Britannica. The Crown Inviolate. Such statements once shook palaces and humbled kings. Those days are now slowly slipping away like the memories of a half-remembered dream. The Crown is no longer the pre-eminent industrial power, and its armies and navies no longer unchallenged in their dominions. Yet, there shall always be strength in the men and women of Albion, and the Crown has many loyal servants still. Rebels, traitors, foreign despots, tyrants and petty kings; The Crown has faced many before and shall do so again before the light fades. This world belongs rightfully to the Crown and let those who arrogantly say otherwise incur the wrath of the righteous, God Save the Queen!



General-Feldmarschall,

Please find below as requested the intelligence briefing compiled by Cadet Steiner at the Staff Academy in Berlin. What his writing lacks in strict discipline he makes up for with an eye for detail and a clear grasp of political realities.

I have taken the liberty of leaving the comments of the examiner in place to and welcome your own assessment of the piece. It would be a great honour to have one of my students accepted for further intelligence training.

Do not hesitate to contact me if you need any further details on the Cadet.

Sincerely,

Oberst Jung!

A STRATEGIC AND POLITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE DOMINIONS OF THE BRITISH CROWN

Submitted for the Intelligence Exam at the Prussian Army Staff Academy

By Cadet A. Steiner

THE SCEPTRED ISLE

Much like our French neighbours, the British Crown and the Dominions it rules has a long and storied history stretching back nearly into antiquity. At first conquered by the Romans, then invaded by Vikings and Normans in the Early Middle Ages, the British Isles were a crucible of war and struggle that necessitated strong centralised leadership. [*Examiner's Note: Fanciful and stylistic. Hardly in keeping with a military essay.*]

Since those Dark Ages onwards, the Kingdom of England developed a

royal bureaucracy that was the envy of European monarchs in its rigidity and its organisational skill. Justice, wealth and power flowed from the monarch directly through royal servants without the normal intermediaries of overmighty feudal subjects vying for power and status. [*Examiner's Note: True, but where are you going with this?*] This habit of centralising royal power soon extended into centralising geographical power on the British Isles. It was the Kingdom of England that waged war or settled the outer kingdoms of Wales, Scotland and Ireland to form a United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and this centralising mission has underpinned all of the Crown's policies since. [*Examiner's Note: A fair point well argued.*]

BLOODSTAINED PAGES OF MISERY

That mission, to impose order upon a disordered world, has not been without setbacks and challenges even as it delivered great successes. The Crown's efforts to involve itself seriously in European affairs have, throughout history, chiefly been poorly managed affairs, although it can be said that the Crown always learns its lesson.

For example, the Royal domains claimed by the English in France since the time of William the Conqueror were never loyal enough to be incorporated into the realm permanently. Whilst monarchs made small attempts to recover them at various points in history, it is clear that this became a matter of prestige and policy rather than a genuine national objective. The Crown learned from the experience that lands not easily conformed to Anglo-Saxon norms were clearly not worth the effort of



keeping, and it allowed the lands in France to be stripped away by resurgent French sentiments during the Middle Ages.

The greatest historical mistake made by the Crown occurred during the reign of King Charles I. Whilst attempting to continue the process of centralising his own rule, Charles I made the mistake of placing his personal ambitions above the corporate ambitions of the crown that he was born to bear. In foisting his own personal rule on his subjects, Charles precipitated the greatest crisis in the Crown's history by encouraging bloody rebellion against the very idea of the British monarchy.

The ensuing Civil Wars (and there were several) tore the kingdom apart and threatened to permanently end the Crown's reign. A republican regime led first by Parliament, then by radicals in the Army and finally under the personal control of one Oliver Cromwell, replaced the monarchy in Great Britain and executed King Charles I for treason against his own people. The royal family fled into exile, and the new Protectorate placed the country under an unpopular tyranny (although the extent of that tyranny has since been exaggerated by historians.) [*Examiner's Note: Keep your historical asides to yourself in future!*]

That the exiled monarchy did not simply wait for the Protectorate to collapse is something of a mystery, but instead of biding his time, Prince Charles duly raised an army of his own whilst in exile and re-invaded his own realm to reclaim the throne. The subsequent War of Reconquest was worse than any of the preceding Civil Wars. Under the superb command of an ailing Oliver Cromwell the republican

forces proved well able to hold their ground against the Royalists. Much of England was ravaged again as the tide of war rumbled back and forth across the kingdoms, and at sea the two sides fell upon one another in a furious contest.

In the end, Cromwell's death in 1658 whilst in the field against Scottish Royalists at the Second Battle of Dunbar was the turning point of the war. Indeed, as mentioned it is likely his Protectorate would have crumbled without him, even if he had died during peacetime [*Examiner's Note: An interesting hypothesis – not the place to expand it of course*]. In the end, a further three years of bloody campaigning would finally place Prince Charles on the throne.

THE RESTORATION

Before his ascension to the throne, Charles II was known for his fondness for drink, for women and for the finer things in life. Upon his ascension as King Charles the Restored, however, the terrible cost of reclaiming his inheritance and the shattered state of the kingdoms itself blackened his mood. He has since been dubbed the "Morose Monarch" in popular opinion, but his sober governmental choices and the policies he established have set a pattern for Crown history ever since.

Charles II acknowledged the mistakes made by his father and vowed never to repeat them again. Insisting upon a contract or agreement between the Crown and its favoured subjects that would ensure popular support for the monarchy. Only when the Crown and the national interests were seen to be one and the same could the Crown hope to survive in an uncertain world.



Under his direction, the Crown massively expanded its reach in day-to-day affairs in its domains, with royal officials becoming vital instruments in even the most benign of transactions and dealings. Nonetheless, a restricted but powerful legislative structure was put in place to ensure that royal power was always tempered by the consent of the people – at least in a controlled way.

Indeed, some of Charles II's darker acts are those most meaningful for modern observers of the Crown. Under his direction a powerful Royal Navy was built up with the sole purpose of defending the home islands but also to extent British power abroad. Colonies established in North America by exiles fleeing the Civil Wars and religious persecution swiftly found themselves brought back under British control. At sea, Charles' Royal Navy waged a brutal campaign against European powers in the Caribbean, often under the cover of piracy, to guarantee British wealth. [*Examiner's Note: This does not seem like a particular dark action – perhaps you have omitted reference to the slave trade for fear of your audience's sensibilities? Do not do so again - to provide accurate intelligence to the Imperium we must supply all possible facts, no exceptions.*]

At home, Charles became increasingly concerned about the defensibility of the towns and cities of his own realm. In 1666 a ruthless campaign of clearances and deliberate demolition was unleashed on London in order to restore the city to glory – to make it a fitting capital for a restored monarchy. With the support of the major aristocrats and merchant houses of the land, Charles II rebuilt London into the brooding city it is today for the sole purpose of creating a modernised defensive capital

to replace the medieval plan fought over during the Civil Wars.

Worse still, and still argued by historians, it is presumed but not proved that Charles II played a hand in the mysterious death of his brother James in 1685. James would have succeeded to the throne upon his brother's death but was considered dangerous for his religious beliefs (a Catholic in a Protestant country – religion played a major part in the Civil Wars) and political views coloured by exile in France and Spain during the Wars of Restoration. James' reign would have been a disaster – or at least so Charles II and his government came to believe – and he was quietly removed.

Charles II clung on to life and died in 1689 aged 58 – his last few years likely extended by his strict abstinence compared to the heady days of his youth. He was succeeded, as agreed, by King William III, Prince of Orange and grandson of King Charles I, nephew to the “Morose Monarch.”

RULE BRITANNIA

From the experiences of the Middle Ages, the Civil Wars and the Restoration, the British Crown learned three important lessons:

1. The realm needed to be culturally homogenous – if not entirely universal, at least at the administrative level the methods and assumptions of governance had to be the same.
2. The realm needed to identify its interests with the needs of the Crown – or else the Crown would fall.
3. The realm needed to be well-defended – or outside threats would dismantle it swiftly and without mercy.



These three principles governed British Crown policy from then on, although no political entity has ever publicly named them as such. A simple analysis of the efforts of the British since the coronation of William III will prove, however, that these unspoken rules have governed its actions up to and including the present day. *[Examiner's Note: A bold statement. Now provide evidence!]*

Firstly, in Ireland, America, India and Africa the British established colonies with Anglicized names and under the governorship of colonial officials from the British Isles. Where the natives spoke a different language, they were encouraged to speak English, where native cultures or beliefs clashed with the established norms those were eradicated or outlawed. In all cases, colonial officials were trained or hired from within established channels – from prestigious families or universities, individuals who can be trusted to place the good of the nation, and the Crown, first.

Secondly, wherever possible, the Crown appointed (in all the places outlined above) sufficient numbers of local leaders and chieftains to positions of power and influence. Local affairs were subordinated to international ones where possible, or local leaders were given a stake in achieving the Crown's goals sufficient to sway their loyalties away from their own people.

Thirdly, throughout the history of these three colonial regions the colonising efforts of the Crown have been backed up by the military might of the Royal Navy and the Royal Army – and more recently by the Royal Flying Corps.

As you can see, whilst outwardly appearing haphazard and without a guiding

intelligence, the British construction of an overseas empire followed a set pattern which confronted or suppressed local cultures and imported British norms backed by military power. It is curious that the greatest failure for the British came not from a truly foreign agency but from the most familiar of sources. *[Examiner's Note: Well argued. This section is perhaps the best. Would it have been better to start with this analysis?]*

THE AMERICAN REVOLT

Whilst historians still debate exactly what occurred, by my analysis the British failed to fully follow their policy completely in the Thirteen Colonies of North America – a failure which led directly to the collapse of the American empire and a humiliation which has overshadowed Crown policy ever since. At first this was a simple miscalculation – French interests in North America grew far faster than expected and when continental wars spilled into North America the cost of beating them back was considerable. That cost was past onto the American colonists before the colonies themselves felt represented in the Crown's administrative and government circles.

Perhaps it was because of the superficial similarities between the American colonists and their British subjects that convinced the Crown it could act more freely in dealings with America – perhaps it was an error on the part of colonial administrators not to realise the danger they were in – whatever the cause the American Revolt erupted in 1776 and the war was to rage until 1783.

Referred to in the Union of Federated American States as the American Revolution, and celebrated every 4th July, amongst the domains of the Crown's



Dominions the events of 1776 are referred to as the Great Rebellion. Much blood and treasure were spent attempting to crush the American rebels, and even today the suspicion and mistrust bred by the conflict remains strong.

The experience of the Great Rebellion also hardened British attitudes to the rest of the world. The intervention of France during the war on the side of the rebels soured the Crown's relations with foreign powers of all kinds. The fear that other power's might intervene in its affairs at the cost of wealth, lives and influence led to a fourth principle:

4. The realm shall not tolerate an equal – no power beyond the Dominions of the British Crown may lay claim to power or wealth sufficient to challenge the might of the Crown.

THE PRUSSIAN WARS

The fourth principle has governed all of Crown's actions since the loss of their American territories. British naval power was extended across the globe to strangle foreign trade and force subservience on other mercantile powers. All claims of creating a "Pax Britannica" on behalf of all nations was nothing but propaganda to cover blatant imperialist aggression.

Under the influence of their newfound determination to brook no challenge, the British government paid far more attention than usual to the affairs of the European powers in the 19th Century. The rise of Napoleon was of great concern to the Crown, especially given the close links between Revolutionary France and the former American colonies.

This concern soon gave way to fears of Prussian dominance. With the entire continent of Europe transformed into a single armed camp, the British Isles' safety could no longer be guaranteed, and the very heartland of the Crown would be under permanent threat. Whilst I have been unable to confirm whether British fears of a Prussian invasion were well-founded the threat was sufficiently real enough to provoke the Crown into action. *[Examiner's Note: All files from the period remain sealed by Teutonic instruction.]*

The British declaration of war in 1813 certainly took the early Imperium by surprise, concentrating as it was on the final defeat of the French Republic and the strategic disaster unfolding in the east. The flank march undertaken by the Duke of Wellington, who remains a national hero, that led to the Battle of Waterloo is rightly studied still at their Sandhurst Academy and at our own War College in Berlin. Nonetheless, it is a perfect illustration of the British mindset: a short, limited campaign to achieve maximum strategic impact, destabilising the foe and preventing them from achieving victory.

PERFIDIOUS ALBION

A sweeping overview of British policy since the Prussian Wars will reveal the same pattern repeating itself over again. A potential threat to Crown dominance is identified, and the opportune moment taken to strike and destabilise the threat before it becomes too powerful to resist.

Over the last fifty years or so British military power has been brought to bear against almost every major power and many smaller ones to preserve its military pre-eminence.



In India rebellious provinces have been suppressed with the help of local allies, and then against those same local allies with the support of the pacified Indian provinces. In Africa, war has been waged against various tribes, destabilising some and absorbing others before then attacking their former allies. Local powers unable to secure the friendship of another European power frequently find themselves at the mercy of Crown “gunboat diplomacy.”

In America, British military forces staged periodic spoiling attacks from Canadian soil early in the century, which then expanded into a naval blockade of both sides during the ensuing Civil War. There is good evidence to suggest that the Crown was instrumental in easing the passage of weapons of war and supplies to both sides during that conflict thanks to their dominance of worldwide trade.

In Asia, the sheer strength of the Celestian Empire has prevented the Crown from indulging in excessive displays of military force, with the exception of, aggressively patrolling its own trade routes. The recent failed intervention in Korea, working in partnership with the Russians, was clearly modelled on similar military adventures around the globe although the results have only hardened British attitudes towards that distant and mysterious power. All the more interesting is that only a decade ago both Britain and Russia were at war with each other in the Crimea – with the tacit support of the French. Truly, the British are not ones for making lasting friendships with anyone. *[Examiner's Note: Divide and Rule. The age-old adage of Crown imperialism. Thank goodness for our more liberal approach – centralise, consolidate and command.]*

AN ISOLATED POWER

That brings us neatly to the present situation. British power has been without serious challenge for over sixty years, and the Crown's willingness to stand alone has given its people a golden century of dominance and superiority. But that superiority is beginning to slip, and even subjects in the home islands are beginning to see that the world has changed within their lifetimes. British power is no longer exercised so aggressively, nor can it dictate terms to foreign potentates with the same bravura attitude of before. The Dominions have also become more independent, with their own governing structures and strategic concerns that are no longer openly subservient to the whims of Whitehall. *[Examiner's Note: Could you expand on this point? Perhaps there is the possibility of splitting the Dominions off from the Crown completely?]*

With supremacy came complacency, and British military technology has lagged behind other powers' even as the technological revolution brought on by the Covenant of the Enlightened has unfurled. Whilst domestic technology is as developed as anywhere else, much of the extensive military might of the Crown is based on older technologies. British naval vessels, whilst still sturdy and powerful, are labour intensive affairs both in construction and operation. Tactics and military thinking have remained largely unchanged, especially in the upper echelons where aristocratic connections are sometimes valued more than military experience. *[Examiner's Note: Not a problem unique to the British unfortunately.]*



British leaders are unwilling to truly concede that maintaining the Pax Britannica in this new world has become next to impossible. At the current rate of industrial and military growth, the Union of Federated American States will outstrip the British economy by the 1890s. (Our own industrial output is already at 87% that of the British.) Within a scant decade, even the Latin Alliance will be able to claim that its navy is at a ratio of 1:3 with the Royal Navy the Crown cares so much about. *[Examiner's Note: These statistics are out of date and require citation. Please revise before final submission.]*

LAND OF HOPE AND GLORY

The reality is that after decades of playing one enemy against the other, the Crown cannot afford to provoke the general war that would be required to maintain its position. Nonetheless, the British Dominions remain a formidable foe – one backed into a corner and prepared to fight to the last to preserve its gains.

This explains the present political situation in the British Dominions. The current prime minister, Benjamin Disraeli, is leader of a faction in the House of Commons known colloquially as the “Knights”. The Knights are believers in the power and glory of the Crown’s Dominions and are willing to risk much in defending it. They are fundamentally opposed, in principle, to most major reforms of the Dominions and are (especially amongst reactionaries) unwilling to consider that it has any flaws. For our purposes, the maintenance of the Knight government would be most beneficial in terms of policy.

Unfortunately, the Knights have several “secret weapons” that make them dangerous enemies. Firstly, the vast majority of British public support the Knights and have done for many years. That blind assumption of superiority, now innate to the subject of the Crown ensures that the Knights’ policies play well in the occasional elections throughout the Dominions. It also means that the Knights can mobilise mass support when needed, potentially overcoming the manpower intensive problems inherent to the Crown’s military.

Secondly, the Knights’ own assumptions of superiority means they are more willing to provoke an early confrontation with a foreign enemy; assured of their own preparedness to defeat an enemy, the Knights may well end up impetuously charging into a war they have little hope of winning. And yet, in doing so they may also prove themselves right – by confronting its enemies now the Crown may yet buy itself some time to achieve victory, before its foes have become too technologically, industrially or militarily advanced. *[Examiner's Note: Interesting point – encouraging the Knights too much may lead to a confrontation with the Crown that we are not yet ready for. Even now there are officers in the Imperial Prussian Navy who consider open confrontation with the Royal Navy a poor strategy for much the same reason.]*

In short, the Knights may end up creating the circumstances for the very reforms they love to despise. By uniting the British public behind their “Britannic Glory” rhetoric they will tap into the greatest resource the Crown has – its people. Stubborn and yet ingenious under pressure, those same people will be galvanised by the



Knights' patriotism to innovate, improve and develop. In the end, the Knights own conservative instincts may actually unleash forces they cannot truly control.

FORTRESS BRITANNIA

The Knights' pre-eminence at the moment rests on their mass support, but if they suffer another misadventure like Korea, Disraeli's government is unlikely to survive for much longer. Much like their masters, the British voter is a stubborn and mercurial beast, quick to change his or her opinions and often likely to vote against a motion merely because they felt their support had been taken for granted.

Enter William Gladstone, leader of the Rooks. Unlike their opponents, the Rooks believe that the Crown would be best served by a period of withdrawal and consolidation rather than ineffectual defiance and bluster. Only by harnessing the forces of new technology, and the varied cultures and peoples of the Crown's Dominions, can it hope to survive in this new and modern age.

This philosophy makes the Rooks dangerous in the long term, as given free reign over British government would see root-and-branch reform that would cut out a lot of the dead wood throughout both the administration and the military of the Crown – and lead to a dangerous revitalisation of its capability in the long term. Of course, such things can be overstated, but the danger presented by Gladstone's reformist zeal is all too clear.

As a case in point, the last Rook administration reformed wholesale the Crown's military according to the "Three Armadas" Review – which centralised and then standardised the Royal Navy, Royal

Flying Corps and Army into three "fleets". The rank structure was made uniform across the three services, and clear lines of seniority established. The practice of buying and selling commissions was abolished above a certain grade, and military recruitment was opened to individuals throughout the Crown's territories. The Dominion Reform was even more alarming – the colonial administrations of Canada, South Africa and India were all recognised as legitimate semi-autonomous authorities, with their own independent administrations and militaries, albeit under a certain element of central direction. Only a foolish attempt to expand the reforms to fractious Ireland brought Gladstone's project to a screeching halt.

Luckily, the British public at the moment considers Gladstone and his colleagues as naysayers and doom-mongers; more interested in "talking the Crown and her Dominions down" than in truly attempting to fix its problems. As previously stated, however, this could change if the Knights are unable to deliver on the fiction of Crown superiority indefinitely.

[Examiner's Note: An excellent summary of the dangers the Rooks pose in the long term. However, even in Opposition they could prove damaging. The British government has in the past shown a willingness to adjust course on the fly, poaching popular policies from other quarters if necessary. How flexible are the Knights in their patriotic insistence that nothing should change?]

TEMPLARS OF THE CROWN

The Rooks will need to be watched carefully, especially if they achieve power in the near future. Another aberration, however, deserves our total attention. An institution dedicated solely to the service of



the Crown, the Templars are something of an oddity worldwide.

Officially, they are the “Royal Templars of the Round Table”, established or re-established by King George III after the loss of the American colonies. They claim, truthfully or not it is impossible to tell, to be the modern incarnation of a much older institution, whether that is indeed the Round Table of Arthurian romance or something else is unclear. Certainly, its members are officially knighted by the reigning monarch and its symbolism is replete with esoteric meaning. It is unclear what, if any, relation they have with the Knights Templar of Medieval Europe, although the similarities are there.

Unlike the Teutonic Knights, however, the Templars make no effort to directly rule their people and instead seem to be dedicated quite selflessly to the preservation and reform of the Crown to make it stronger. [*Examiner’s Note: Are you suggesting that the Teutonic Knights are not selflessly dedicated to the preservation and reform of the Imperium?*] The Templars sponsor political groups affiliated with both the Knights and the Rooks, fund technological research councils and academic committees. So-called “think-tanks” associated with the Templars have been behind many of the greatest reforms and innovations in British life in the past century – yet the Templars themselves take little of the credit, and merely move on to the next problem.

The Templars have established chapters throughout the Crown and have recently been identified as sponsoring movements throughout the Dominions – including some organisations that campaign for

greater autonomy for these former colonies. Exactly how encouraging such radical ideas defends the Crown is unclear, yet there is one theory advanced by Professor Herford in Vienna. [*Examiner’s Note: A crank. None of his papers achieved sufficient peer-reviewed scores to be published. Surely you do not truly agree with him?*] Herausford posits that the Templars take a far longer-term view of the strategic situation than most. Their ultimate goal is to safeguard the Crown, not preserve the British Dominions in its current form. In truth, their strategy may involve killing the Crown in order to save it.

Nonetheless, the Templars remain a silent but committed presence in British daily life. Many charities working with the poor and invalid within the Crown’s cities rely on donations sourced from Templar funds (if indirectly channelled via other religious institutions or secular concerns). It should be noted that the Templars also commit military forces to battle as well. These units were once more likely to be support based than frontline combatants, often medical support units or rear-echelon troops working to serve the rank-and-file of the British Land Fleet. Recently, more dedicated combat troops have appeared bearing the blazon of the “Order of St. John”, believed to come from the Templar fortress on Malta. Such units are often fast and deadly, using speed and shield technology to defend themselves and shelter other Crown forces. It is believed that some amongst the Templars are forecasting a violent confrontation in the near future, one which will require their own knights to participate in. [*Examiner’s Note: Your survey of the Templars is interesting, but I fail to see exactly how important this is to our overall understanding of the Crown’s strategic*



identity. The Templars are a minor concern, and in the event of war, Malta will surely fall to the Teutonic Knights as planned.]

IN CONCLUSION

The British Crown and her Dominions are a study in contradictions: all at once it is both strong and weak, advancing and retreating, globally powerful and yet also unable to dictate terms. This tension at the heart of the Crown becomes more pronounced with every passing year as its foes grow stronger and more emboldened and as its leaders become more aware that their old certainties and prejudices no longer apply.

Yet at the same time, that tension provides a great reserve of strength, like galvanic energy stored in a battery or a tank of RJ-1027. Whilst a careful pinprick might cause the contents to leak out in a dull fizz or with a limp gurgle, it may also trigger an explosive reaction that would consume those foolish enough to get close.

This leaves us with difficult choices to make. The British Crown and her Dominions are like a wounded lion, pitiable in its agony and yet still possessed of great and terrible strength. Do we provoke it? Walking into the proverbial lion's den as Daniel did of old? Will it lie down and accept the end or savage us with all the ferocity of a master predator? Or do we stay at a distance and let its strength ebb away and risk allowing

it the time to heal and return stronger than ever? [Examiner's Note: Far too heavy on the metaphors. Nonetheless, a good way of summarising your appraisal – even if it is too florid for my tastes.]

Final Examiners Remarks: A strong essay that summarises and identifies the main themes in Crown history well. You draw some excellent strategic and political commentary out of the historical details and provide a good overview of the modern political realities as well. Dwelling on the Templars is unnecessary, they are a romanticised curio, not a genuine institution whatever the similarities to the Teutonic Knights. Your description of “secret weapons” of the Knights and your final summary (metaphors aside) are stand-out pieces of analysis – the Crown is both ready to fall and yet also still a terrifying foe we cannot be certain of beating yet.

Moderated Score – 77

My dear Oberst,

Thank you for directing this young man to my attention. Regrettably he will no longer be attending your classes in the future. Rest assured, however, that his brilliant mind will be of service to the Imperium in a different capacity. Nil Obstat.

General-Feldmarschall Storck

Knight Commander of the Luminary Rite

