

Meet King Charles, The Great Resetter

[Meet King Charles, The Great Resetter](#)

by [James Corbett](#), [The Corbett Report](#)

May 5, 2023

While most of the the public's attention is falling on the obvious issues—the monarchy's increasing irrelevance to the 21st century, the colossal waste of taxpayer resources that go towards the upkeep of the world's richest family and their multiple palaces, the dark history of slavery and other colonial abuses for which royals of the far-distant past are responsible—few are aware of just how dark the history of the royal family is, or just how twisted Charles' vision for the future of the United Kingdom—and, indeed the world—really is.

Watch

on [Archive](#) / [BitChute](#) / [Odysee](#) / [Rokfin](#) / [Rumble](#) / [Substack](#)

Transcript

[Royal fanfare.]

GARTER KING OF ARMS DAVID VINES WHITE: Whereas it has pleased almighty God to call to his mercy our late Sovereign lady Queen Elizabeth II of blessed and glorious memory, by whose decease the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland is solely and rightfully come to the Prince Charles Philip Arthur George.

We, therefore, the lords spiritual and temporal of this realm, and members of the House of Commons, together with

other members of Her late Majesty's Privy Council, and representatives of the realms and territories, aldermen, and citizens of London and others, do now hereby, with one voice and consent of tongue and heart, publish and proclaim that the Prince Charles Philip Arthur George, is now, by the death of our late Sovereign of happy memory, become our only lawful and rightful liege lord, Charles III.

SOURCE: [Charles III proclaimed king in historic ceremony @BBCNews – BBC](#)

It's hard to be a human being living on planet Earth in May of 2023 and *not* be hearing about, reading about or listening to discussions about the pending coronation of King Charles.

Yes, Charles' big day is dominating news headlines at the moment, and it seems that the glitz and glamour of the upcoming coronation are infecting people around the globe with a case of royal fever.

. . . Well, maybe not *everyone*.

TC NEWMAN: Republic states on their website: "As we approach Charles' coronation the country needs an honest, grown-up debate about the monarchy. We need to stop and ask ourselves: Can't we just choose our next head of state?"

SOURCE: [King Charles Heckled by Anti-Monarchy Protestors](#)

PROTESTER: Charles, while we struggle to heat our homes we have to pay for your parade.

CHARLES: Oh.

PROTESTER: The taxpayer pays £100 million for you, and what for? Nid fy brenin! Not my King!

SOURCE: [Taxpayers 'pay for your parade': Charles heckled in Wales on cost of monarchy](#)

[Protester throws eggs at Charles, gets arrested.]

SOURCE: [Watch: Protester throws eggs at King Charles III](#)

No, not everyone is happy about King Charles stepping into his mother's shoes . . . or diamond-encrusted loafers, or gold-plated clodhoppers, or whatever it is that monarchs wear to prevent their poor, delicate royal feet from touching the earth.

But while most of the public's attention is falling on the obvious issues—the monarchy's increasing irrelevance to the 21st century, the colossal waste of taxpayer resources that go towards the upkeep of the world's richest family and their multiple palaces, the dark history of slavery and other colonial abuses for which royals of the far-distant past are responsible—few are aware of just how dark the history of the royal family is, or just how twisted Charles' vision for the future of the United Kingdom—and, indeed the world—really is.

I'm James Corbett of [The Corbett Report](#), and today we're going to look beyond the headlines and talking points so that we can **Meet King Charles, The Great Resetter.**

Chapter 1 – King Charles



For those who do not consider themselves “royal watchers” and

only know the new King of England as that buffoon who spent his entire life waiting for his mother to die, the first sign of what Charles is *really* like came in a [viral video moment](#) captured during the typically pompous ceremony in which he was proclaimed king.

There, in the manic, sausage-fingered, tooth-gripped flailing of the new king, is the perfect encapsulation of Charles Philip Arthur George Windsor, aka “Charles III.”

His life has been an endless series of carefully arranged photo opportunities and ribbon-cutting ceremonies that serve no actual function other than to punctuate the dreary luxury of his royal existence. But it is in moments such as these where we see through the veil of PR and propaganda to the real Charles: a man who treats his retinue of servants like mere objects, only good for slaking his royal desires and fulfilling his regal demands.

And demands there are.

His royal highness’s [daily demands](#) begin with the pressing of his royal shoelaces and the requirement that his royal bath plug be placed in precisely the right position and the royal bathtub be exactly half full of precisely tepid water. Charles’ valet must then squeeze precisely one inch of toothpaste onto his royal toothbrush while the royal chefs prepare a series of boiled eggs, which are numbered according to how long they were boiled [so that](#): “If the prince felt that number five was too runny, he could knock the top off number six or seven.”

In fact, wherever Charles travels, he not only takes along a large contingent of his 124 member staff—including his butler, two valets, a private secretary, a typist, a chef, and a handful of bodyguards—he *also* makes sure to take his own personal food supply, consisting solely of fresh, organic ingredients grown on his own organic farm.

Yes, King Charles is [more than happy](#) to put his John Hancock on [The Genetic Technology Precision Breeding Act 2023](#), which (as [its supporters will be happy to explain](#)) “remov[es] barriers to research into new gene editing technology” by (as its supporters will never explain) “remov[ing] regulatory safeguards from whole subclasses of genetically modified organisms” at the behest of (surprise, surprise!) the GMO industry.

But don't expect him to put those gene-edited Frankenfoods anywhere near *his* lips! They are *not* fit for the royal gullet, don't you know!

Chapter 2 – The Royal Sickness



In a sense, the royals aren't wrong when they assert that the blood that flows through their veins is different from the blood that flows through us commoners' veins. As many know, the royal families of Europe *do* indeed suffer from a genetic blood disorder, hemophilia, one of the many defects that has resulted from centuries of inbreeding.

But, strangely, they do not see their so-called “blue blood” as a problem. Instead, they hue to a twisted belief system;

one that holds that as a result of their special blood, the royals actually deserve to rule over their subjects.

In order to understand this royal worldview, we have to go back to the beginning. No, not the beginning of Elizabeth's reign in 1552. Not to the beginning of the English branch of the House of "Windsor" to which she belonged. Not even to the beginning of the monarchical system in England.

No, we have to go back to the beginning of monarchy itself.

You see, the ancient Egyptians worshipped the Pharaohs as progeny of the sun god, Ra. The Japanese were told that their Imperial family descended from the sun goddess, Amaterasu, and the sea god, Ryuujin. In Europe, monarchs claimed that God Himself had directly granted them a "Divine Right" to rule over their subjects. In China, they called it the "Mandate of Heaven."

Yes, the ancients were taught to believe that their emperors were literal gods. The European dynasties, meanwhile, flourished for centuries under the mass delusion that these families were specifically selected by God to rule over their people. Should it come as any surprise that at some point the royals started to believe their own propaganda?

But, as these proto-eugenicists soon figured out, if their blood was too precious to mingle with the commoners', then that blood must be kept in the family. And so began centuries of royal inbreeding that resulted in the deformities, abnormalities and genetic weirdness that today pervade the royal bloodlines ([congenital haemophilia](#) being just one of the most well-known examples). Perhaps the most notable example of intra-family marriage leading to genetic ruin is that of the Spanish Hapsburgs, who, after 500 years of ruling over vast swaths of Europe, managed to [inbreed themselves out of existence](#).

With this understanding of the proto-eugenical philosophy as

our background, we can begin to make sense of the millennium-long story of the British monarchy. Alfred the Great yadda yadda Henry beheading wives and starting a church blah blah the madness of King George etc. etc. etc. [Mrs. John Brown](#) and so on and so forth all the way up to Eddie (VII, for those keeping track at home) and the intrigues that [kicked off WWI](#) and birthed the modern world. You know, *that* story.

To *finish* making sense of that history, we just need to add one other element to the story: as it turns out, the “British” royal family isn’t very British at all. The House of “Windsor” only became the House of “Windsor” in 1917, after all. Before that, it was [Saxe Coburg-Gotha](#). But the British public were a bit fired up about the Huns because of that whole, you know, WWI thing, so “Windsor” it became.

Noting the true origins of the House of “Windsor” is not just some cheap anti-Germanic slur, of course. It points to something even more fundamental. These royals—connected, as we remember, through inbreeding—had much more in common with their European brothers and sisters, cousins and uncles (but I repeat myself), than they did with the populations they were supposedly ruling over.

With that historical background in place, we can understand, for example, the Windsors’ well-documented fondness for the eugenics-promoting Nazis. Where do you think the Nazis got their eugenical beliefs from, after all? Given the royal pedigree of the eugenic worldview, it is perhaps unsurprising to learn that the pseudoscience of eugenics was pioneered by [Royal Medal recipient](#) Francis Galton, himself hailing from the celebrated (and [thoroughly inbred](#)) Darwin-Galton line, which boasted many esteemed Fellows of the Royal Society.

The [overt ties](#) between the Edwardian (VIII, for those keeping track at home) court and Hitler’s eugenics-obsessed regime are well-documented. The covert ties are even more intriguing. (Hmmm, that gives me an idea for a documentary) But it

isn't just the home movies showing the future queen [giving the Nazi salute](#) or Edward VIII's hobnobbing with Hitler or King Charles' lifelong friendship with unreformed SS officer (and Bilderberg co-founder) [Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands](#) or Prince Harry's [predilection for Nazi cosplaying](#). More to the heart of the matter is Prince Philip's infamous desire to be reincarnated as "[a particularly deadly virus](#)" in order to contribute to the depopulation of the planet (a remark that has been fact-checked by Snopes, so you know it's true!).

FIONA BRUCE: What do you see as the biggest challenges in conservation?

PRINCE PHILIP: The growing human population. From where we are there's nothing else.

SOURCE: [Prince Philip on what should be done about "overpopulation"](#)

You see, the royals' blue blood pomposity wouldn't be so bad if they simply felt themselves superior to the commoners in a "What, you [groom your own stool](#)?!" kind of way. Sadly, it is not mere snobbery that motivates them, and their great desire is not simply to be kept apart from the commoners. As it turns out, the royal family doesn't just feel superior to their subjects, they actively dislike them and constantly scheme to subjugate them, rob them, impoverish them and mislead them.

Chapter 3 – Royal False Flags



There's something quaint about Redditors seemingly [discovering for the first time](#) that, far from some nice old man who waves to the crowds and enjoys tea and crumpets in pretty English gardens, King Charles is actually the heir to a fortune amassed via the violent subjugation of much of the world's populace and the plundering of their wealth and resources. The fact that anyone could be shocked by this historical reality speaks to the naïveté of the masses, who cannot imagine that ruthless psychopaths conspire to amass more wealth by inflicting suffering on the world.

(Just wait until these dear, trusting masses learn about [the British East India Company](#) and [the opium wars](#) and [the Bengal genocide](#) and [the Boer concentration camps](#) and [the Amritsar Massacre](#), etc., etc., etc. . . .)

But for a prime example of the perfidy with which the British monarchy has ruled for centuries (and which gave rise to the "[Perfidious Albion](#)" moniker), one need only look at the history of their speciality: false flag operations.

Befitting the governing monarchy of a nation that has been [known for its treachery](#) for centuries, the British royals' use of false flag events to gin up public support for the persecution of their enemies likewise goes back centuries.

For one prime example of that, we will have to "[Remember, remember the fifth of November.](#)"

Outside of Britain, the "gunpowder plot" is known only tangentially through cultural artifacts, like the references to the plot contained in *V for Vendetta* and the subsequent adoption of the Guy Fawkes mask as the symbol of Anonymous. Even in England, most will only know the official version of the story—the one compiled in the so-called "[King's Book](#)" written by King James I himself.

According to that official account: on the evening of November 4, 1605, Guy Fawkes was discovered with 36 barrels of gunpowder and a pile of wood and coal in the undercroft beneath the House of Lords in Parliament, presumably preparing to blow up the building. After his apprehension, Fawkes was brought before the king and, cracking under the interrogation, eventually led the king's agents to the other conspirators in the plot.

As it turned out, the whole harebrained scheme to blow up Parliament as it convened on the 5th of November had been hatched by the Jesuits and carried out by a ragtag group of crazed provincial English Catholics! King James then took the sensible precaution of cracking down on Catholics in England, **thus ensuring that Catholic treachery would never again threaten the kingdom.**

Of course, this story—like so much of the [history written by the winners](#)—is total hogwash. Entire books could be written about the plot, what we really know about it, and how the official version was conjured into existence . . . and at least one book has! It's called [The Gunpowder Plot](#) and it was written by Hugh Ross Williamson and published in 1952.

Those who are interested in the full story are highly encouraged to read Williamson's account. Although the full truth of the plot will likely never be known—buried as it is

in a sea of forged documents, tampered evidence and official secrecy—we can say with certainty that the official story was constructed from torture testimony and forged confessions, that the king's spies were likely involved at every level of the plot, that the band of patsies who were ultimately blamed for the whole affair could not possibly have perpetrated it by themselves and, most importantly, that it provided King James with the perfect excuse to crack down on Catholics in the exact manner he had desired.

In other words, Guy Fawkes was likely neither the radical Catholic terrorist mastermind that the court of King James made him out to be nor the crusading anti-authoritarian hero that *V for Vendetta* and Anonymous pretend him to be, but, rather, a patsy, a dupe or a mole who was used by the monarchy as a convenient excuse to enact draconian new laws clamping down on the king's opponents.

Go figure.

But the British monarchy's false flag hits don't stop there!

Viewers of my [WWI Conspiracy](#) documentary will already know the central role played by King Edward VII and his German-hating wife in forging the so-called "[Triple Entente](#)" between Britain, France and Russia that paved the way for the "Great" War against the Huns. You will likely also remember WWI conspirator Edward Mandell House's own account of his rather remarkable conversation with Edward VII's successor, King George V, on the morning of May 7, 1915. As House [recounts in his Intimate Papers](#), the two "fell to talking, strangely enough, of the probability of Germany sinking a trans-Atlantic liner." Even more "coincidentally," House relates that George specifically inquired what would happen if the Huns "should sink the *Lusitania* with American passengers on board." Later that very day, the *Lusitania* was sunk, and public opinion in America turned decidedly against Germany, preparing the way for US entry into the war on Britain's side.

Coincidence, surely.

“But that’s ancient history!” some would argue. “I mean, yes, the British were responsible for backing, supporting and enabling the Saudi royal family to begin their brutal rule of the Arabian peninsula and” (as I documented in [False Flags: The Secret History of Al Qaeda](#)), “British support and collusion with the Muslim Brotherhood and with Wahabbi radicals gave birth to the modern era of false flag terrorism . . . but what does that have to do with King Charles?”

Good question. Maybe some intrepid reporter will put the question of the [million-pound donation he received from the bin Laden family](#) to the new king?

Or maybe they could ask about Princess Diana’s remarkable clairvoyance in warning of her own death at the hands of . . . [name redacted]

NARRATOR: In October 1996, in a letter to her butler, Princess Diana expressed the fear that she would die in a car crash and it wouldn’t be an accident.

ACTOR (AS PRINCESS DIANA): I am sitting here at my desk today in October, longing for someone to hug me and encourage me to keep strong and hold my head up high. This particular phase in my life is the most dangerous. X is planning an accident in my car. Brake failure and serious head injury [. . .].

SOURCE: [What Really Happened On The Night Of Diana & Dodi’s Crash? | Diana: The Inquest | Real Royalty](#)

Given the royal family’s participation in false flag events in the past, perhaps it is no surprise that World Economic Forum chairman Klaus Schwab invited His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales to inaugurate The Great Reset, the grand global attempt to use the generated crisis of the scamdemic to completely transform the world and institute new paradigms of governance

and social control.

CHARLES: We have a golden opportunity to seize something good from this crisis. Its unprecedented shockwaves may well make people more receptive to big visions of change. Our global crises like pandemics and climate change know no borders and highlight just how interdependent we are as one people sharing one planet.

[. . .]

And as we move from rescue to recovery, therefore we have a unique but rapidly shrinking window of opportunity to learn lessons and reset ourselves on a more sustainable path. It is an opportunity we have never had before and may never have again, so we must use all the levers we have at our disposal, knowing that each and every one of us has a vital role to play.”

SOURCE: [Prince Charles Says Pandemic a Chance to ‘Think Big and Act Now’](#)

Yes, it is no surprise to find this royal mouthpiece popping up in the defining false flag event of our times, advocating a complete re-envisioning of our economy, our way of life and even the social contract between people and their government on the back of a synthetic and constructed “crisis.”

But if only his involvement in false flag events were the greatest of King Charles’ worries. . .

Chapter 4 – The Windsors’ Pedophile Problem



Oh, if only the new king's greatest fault were to have been born into a eugenics-obsessed family.

If only he were the guiltless benefactor of the cheating, swindling, extortion, theft and plunder of his forebears.

If only his worst sin were his [ridiculous climate hypocrisy](#) or his [campaigning for Klaus Schwab's Great Reset](#) or his attempt to [mask cows](#).

If only he were a regular, run-of-the-mill tyrant, a psychopath who got off on torturing and killing others.

Unfortunately for all of us, it's much worse than that.

ANCHOR: Reports of Savile's unusual behavior in royal circles came about as details emerged of a surprise role for him as a counselor for Prince Charles and Princess Diana during their marital difficulties and a request from Prince Charles to help with the image of Sarah Ferguson.

SOURCE: [Jimmy Savile: 'licked young women's arms' on Palace visits](#)

The public got a hint of what *really* goes on behind the royal family's closed castle gates when the [Jimmy Savile](#)

[scandal](#) first came to light a decade ago. If you are able to cast your mind back to the innocent days of 2012, you might recall that, at the time, the existence of high-level pedophile rings (let alone high-level necrophilic pedophile rings) was considered the stuff of total conspiracy lunacy.

You might also recall that the royal family's relationship to Savile was certainly "problematic" (to use the kids' lingo). But, given what the public then knew, not necessarily *more* problematic than the involvement of any of the other people who had cozied up to the monstrous pedophile during the course of his career.

Sure, the Queen *had* knighted Savile back in 1990, and any number of photographs could tell you that he was awfully chummy with Charles. Yet perhaps knighthood was to be expected, considering that he had seemingly dedicated much of his life to charity and had made many high-profile friends along the way.

In fact, the first hard questions about who knew what when about Savile were asked of the BBC, which certainly [did know](#) about the allegations many decades before the [disgusting abuser](#) finally died.

JON SNOW: One of the things that's really interested me there was your view about Jimmy Savile and your knowledge at the time that it was going on.

JOHN LYDON: Yeah. Unfortunately, I think all of us—what we call "the peoples"—knew what was going on with the BBC.

SNOW: As bad as we now know it was?

LYDON: Yeah, we knew. We all knew.

SOURCE: [John Lydon on Jimmy Savile and BBC](#)

But over the years the "who could have known?" routine used by the Windsors' defenders has become increasingly insupportable.

First, there was the revelation that Savile was so close to the royal family that he was [almost made Prince Harry's godfather](#). Then came the increasingly damning reports on Savile's close personal friendship with Charles, culminating in the release earlier this year of letters proving that the now-King of England regularly [sought Savile's advice](#) on sensitive political matters

ALISON BELLAMY: It's not just a couple—you know it's not just three or four. There's absolutely loads—there's files of it!

ALISON BELLAMY [READING LETTER FROM PRINCE CHARLES TO JIMMY SAVILE]: December 22, 1989. I wonder if you would ever be prepared to meet my sister-in-law, the Duchess of York? I can't help feeling that it would be extremely helpful to her if you could. I feel she could do with some of your straightforward common sense.

NEWS ANCHOR: 54 minutes after they'd taken off without warning or distress signal, the airliner started to disintegrate over Lockerbie.

ALISON BELLAMY: January 27, 1989. A month after the Lockerbie disaster. This is Jimmy giving PR advice to the royal family about how to react publicly when there's a major incident in Britain.

PRINCE ANDREW: I suppose that, statistically, something like this has got to happen at some stage on a time. But of course, it only affects the community in a very small way.

ALISON BELLAMY [READING LETTER]: Jimmy advises the queen should be informed in advance of any proposed action by family members. Jimmy suggests they should have a coordinator who's a special person with considerable experience in such matters. There must be an incident room with several independent phone lines, Teletex, etc.

ALISON BELLAMY: I mean, Jimmy is advising them how to do it. What they should do. How they should act. What they should say. Should they say anything.

So Charles says to Jimmy: "I attach a copy of my memo on disasters, which incorporates your points, and I showed it to my father and he showed it to her majesty."

Jimmy had sent back to Charles a five-part manual titled "Guidelines for members of the Royal Family and their staffs." Jimmy seems to be a kind of unofficial chief advisor to the Prince of Wales.

SOURCE: [Jimmy Savile: A British Horror Story](#)

And on top of all that, there was Savile's own uncomfortable admission that the knighthood had "[let him off the hook](#)" for his past sins.

Unsurprisingly, the royal family has never had to respond in any way to public outrage about these reports. No presstitute who wants to keep his job is ever going to dare press Charles on the issue and, since Savile's crimes were only brought to light after his death, the royals could always hide behind the "plausible deniability" that they didn't know what Sir Jimmy was up to. They didn't even need to launch a formal process to strip Savile of his knighthood because, as it turns out, the honour "[automatically expire\[s\] when a person dies.](#)"

But, as I say, the Savile scandal blew up back in the bygone era of a decade ago, when the concept of political pedophile rings was still in the realm of [crazed conspiracy podcasts](#). That all changed, of course, when the Epstein story finally broke into the public consciousness in 2019.

And who just happened to be in the middle of that scandal?



That's right, Prince Andrew. The brother of the current king and the eighth in line to the British throne. A man so transparently lecherous that for *decades* the UK tabloids have mockingly referred to him as "Randy Andy." A man who literally [had to invent a scientifically unknown condition](#) of being "[unable to sweat](#)" to try to "prove" that the allegations made against him by Jeffrey Epstein victim Virginia Giuffre were false.

I mean, yes, there's the photo of him with his arm around an underage Giuffre (with intelligence handler and convicted sex trafficker Ghislaine Maxwell hovering in the background), but he doesn't sweat so . . . it's all a lie?

No one buys anything that comes out of the mouth of His Royal Lowness, Prince Andrew, Duke of Dork. After all, you know someone must be a public relations mess when even the royal family is compelled to [revoke his titles and royal patronages](#) to keep him out of the spotlight of public scrutiny. As we've seen, the royals didn't even dole out that form of retroactive punishment to Sir Jimmy.

As we all know, the public is no longer as naïve as they were in 2012, and, sadly, the nightmarish reality of protected political pedophile rings is so accepted as documented fact that it is no longer mocked as conspiracy yarn. And, to the

surprise of no one who is familiar with the ignoble history of the royal family, the House of Windsor has been implicated in two of the highest profile pedophile scandals in recent memory. . . . Oh wait, [make that three](#).

So here's a rhetorical question for you: who in the controlled mainstream media do you think will ever dare bring up this topic up again now that Prince Charles is officially King Charles?

Conclusion



Making this video feels like I'm telling a child, all in one sitting, that Santa Claus isn't real, the Easter Bunny is a hoax and the tooth fairy is just your mom.

But, in reality, it's worse than that. It's telling fully grown adults that Santa Claus isn't real, the Easter Bunny is a hoax and the tooth fairy is just their mom and being ridiculed as a fringe loony for doing so.

This isn't my first attempt at opening eyes on this subject, either. Back in 2015, I made note of the absolute madness that took hold of the global media surrounding the announcement of

the birth of Princess Charlotte, [writing](#):

So who is going so crazy for this royal baby? Surely no one who is familiar with the *real* history of the reign of the “Windsors,” a reign marked by the tens of millions of lives lost in the First and Second World Wars (in which the royal family had a great degree of culpability), close collaboration with the banksters that have brought us to the edge of the next great depression, the [formation](#) of the Anglo-American “special relationship” in common cause with like-minded eugenicists in America [like Teddy Roosevelt](#), the cultivation and protection of pedophiles (of whom [Jimmy Savile](#) was just the most noticeable tip of a very large iceberg), the slaying of Diana, and any number of other atrocities that should make this family one of the most reviled in the “commonwealth” they claim to rule over. And yet the media still lauds their every action, sings their praises as a venerable institution at the core of British society, dutifully acts as the royal PR mouthpiece in reporting on their charity work, and marginalizes any talk of doing away with the royal family altogether as “republican rabble-rousing.”

Plus ça change . . .

And now once again we have one of these royal events come along to remind us just how many people are still firmly ensconced in normieland. After all the royals have put us through, it’s flabbergasting that they’re still held in such high regard.

It’s incomprehensible that this royal eugenicist is trotted out to be the face of The Great Reset and to lecture the peasants about how they’ll have to become serfs on the neofeudal plantation for the sake of Mother Earth, but even more disheartening is the fact that there are still vast swaths of people who believe that this family has been chosen by God Himself to rule over an entire nation (or even a

“commonwealth”).

Here’s to the day when this type of video is completely unnecessary and the placing of a fancy hat on some pompous British octogenarian’s head was of no significance to anyone whatsoever. One can always dream. . . .

This piece first appeared in The Corbett Report Subscriber newsletter [in September 2022](#). To keep up to date with the newsletter, and to support The Corbett Report, please subscribe today.

[Connect with The Corbett Report](#)