



The Crown's Narrative

*Myths, Money and Media in the
Modern British Monarchy*

A CRITICAL EXAMINATION, WITH FACT-CHECK NOTES

MARIE LANDRY

The Crown's Narrative

Myths, Money and Media in the Modern British Monarchy

Marie Landry

Moncton, New Brunswick

The Crown's Narrative: Myths, Money and Media in the Modern British Monarchy

Copyright © 2026 Marie Landry. All rights reserved.

ORCID: 0009-0008-5027-3337

First edition, October 2026.

This book presents a critical, republican-leaning analysis of the British monarchy. Factual claims were checked against public reporting in October 2026; where the original argument overstated or simplified the record, a fact-check note sets out what the evidence actually shows. Figures for royal costs are contested and vary with methodology. Nothing in this book is legal advice.

Contents

Introduction	5
The Financial Myths	6
The Constitutional and Political Myths	9
Propaganda Vectors and Media Management	12
Legal Myths and Special Protections	15
The Propaganda Matrix	16
The Case for the Crown: Counterpoints	17
Sources	19

Introduction

The survival of the British monarchy into the twenty-first century is often explained as a matter of tradition, affection, or simple inertia. This book argues that it rests on something more deliberate: careful media management, historical myth-making, and constitutional narratives that tend to obscure the institution's wealth and its political influence.

Critics, investigative journalists, and political scientists have identified a set of recurring stories that do much of this work. Some concern money: who pays for the monarchy, and who owns what. Some concern power: whether the sovereign is truly neutral, and whether the Crown provides the stability it promises. Others concern the press relationships, public-relations metrics, and imperial rebranding that keep these stories in circulation.

Each chapter takes one family of claims, states the narrative as its defenders usually put it, and then sets out the counter-evidence offered by critics. Because an argument is only as strong as its facts, every section closes with a fact-check note. Where the critique holds up, the note says so and adds the documentary record. Where it overreaches, the note says that too. A concluding chapter gives the strongest case monarchists make in reply, so readers can weigh both sides.

CHAPTER 1

The Financial Myths

Myth: “The Monarchy Pays for Itself Through Tourism”

THE NARRATIVE

The royal family is a net financial positive because tourists come to the UK specifically to see them, bringing in billions of pounds a year.

THE COUNTER-EVIDENCE

Critics argue that tourists visit historic sites such as the Tower of London, Windsor Castle and Buckingham Palace, not the living individuals who occupy them. France abolished its monarchy centuries ago, yet its royal palaces and museums remain among Europe's great draws. Many public royal venues are run by bodies such as Historic Royal Palaces and the Royal Collection Trust, which would exist with or without a reigning family.

Meanwhile the public bill is larger than the headline grant suggests. Once security, policing of royal events, costs to local councils and income forgone on royal buildings are added, campaigners argue the real cost runs to several times the official figure.

FACT-CHECK NOTE

The official Sovereign Grant was £86.3 million in 2024–25 and rose to £132.1 million in 2025–26, driven by a surge in Crown Estate profits from offshore wind leasing. The grant is due to reach £137.9 million in 2026–27, including a final tranche for the ten-year Buckingham Palace reservicing programme.

The anti-monarchy group Republic puts the “true” annual cost at about £510 million, with an estimated £150 million for security as the largest item. This is a campaign estimate: the security figure is not officially published, and critics such as *The Spectator* have challenged it as implausibly high. The original draft's range of £100M–£350M has been replaced here with these sourced figures.

On tourism comparisons: France's most-visited attractions are Disneyland Paris and the Louvre (the world's most-visited art museum). Versailles is popular but not at the top of European rankings, so the comparison is best made with the Louvre, a former royal palace.

Myth: “The Crown Estate Is the Monarch's Personal Property”

THE NARRATIVE

The King generously surrenders the profits of the Crown Estate to the government and receives the Sovereign Grant in return, so public funding is really a rebate of royal money.

THE COUNTER-EVIDENCE

The Crown Estate belongs to the Crown as an institution, not to Charles Windsor as a private individual. Treating a sovereign land holding as a family business lets public funding be framed as a refund rather than what critics say it is: a taxpayer subsidy.

FACT-CHECK NOTE

Confirmed. The Crown Estate itself states that it is not the King's private property, and it cannot be sold by the monarch. Its surplus is paid to the Treasury (the Consolidated Fund), and the Sovereign Grant is then calculated as a percentage of those profits — currently 12%, applied two years in arrears, down from 25% before 2024–25.

Distinct from the Crown Estate are the Duchies of Lancaster and Cornwall, which provide private incomes to the King and the heir. Their status is genuinely disputed: the royals treat them as private estates, while Republic argues they are state property.

CHAPTER 2

The Constitutional and Political Myths

Myth: “The Monarch Is Purely Ceremonial and Politically Neutral”

THE NARRATIVE

The King has no real power, never interferes in politics, and acts strictly on the advice of his ministers.

THE COUNTER-EVIDENCE

Investigative reporting tells a more complicated story. Under the parliamentary procedure known as King's Consent (formerly Queen's Consent) and the parallel Prince's Consent, draft bills that affect the Crown's prerogatives or the sovereign's private interests are put before the royal household before Parliament may pass them.

A Guardian investigation from 2021 found that more than 1,000 laws had been vetted this way since 1952, across areas from food policy and tenancy rights to race relations and parking charges. Archive documents showed royal advisers sometimes seeking changes — for example, a royal solicitor lobbying over traffic rules on the Queen's private estates, and amendments sought to keep her private wealth from public view.

Separately, Prince Charles's private letters to ministers — the “black spider memos” — showed the heir pressing government on badger culls, farming, herbal medicine and other policy, raising questions about undue influence.

FACT-CHECK NOTE

The core claim is supported, but the original draft overstated it. The documented figure is that over 1,000 laws were *vett*ed, not that over 1,000 were *alter*ed; changes were sought in some cases, and Scottish government papers suggest some bills were amended to secure consent.

The black spider memos are a separate matter from Consent. They were released on 13 May 2015 after a ten-year Freedom of Information battle brought by Guardian journalist Rob Evans, ending with a Supreme Court ruling in March 2015.

Buckingham Palace's position is that Consent is a parliamentary process in which the sovereign's role is purely formal and consent is always granted when the government requests it. Constitutional scholars such as Paul Evans have argued the procedure's influence may be no greater than other well-connected lobbies — but that it looks like a veto, and should be reformed or abolished.

Myth: “The Monarchy Provides Political Stability”

THE NARRATIVE

An unelected head of state prevents dictatorship and guarantees constitutional continuity, standing above the fray of partisan politics.

THE COUNTER-EVIDENCE

A head of state who cannot refuse bad laws or dismiss ministers without triggering a constitutional crisis offers little protection against authoritarian drift. The safeguard exists only on paper.

The 2019 prorogation of Parliament illustrates the point. The Queen suspended Parliament on the Prime Minister's advice; it was the courts, not the Crown, that stopped it.

FACT-CHECK NOTE

Confirmed with context. On 24 September 2019 the Supreme Court ruled unanimously that Boris Johnson's advice to the Queen to prorogue Parliament was unlawful, and that the prorogation was void. The Queen acted on that advice, as constitutional convention requires her to.

Defenders read the same episode the other way: the monarch's restraint kept the Crown out of politics and left an independent judiciary to resolve the dispute, which arguably shows the system working. Whether that counts as stability or as powerlessness is the heart of the debate.

CHAPTER 3

Propaganda Vectors and Media Management

The Royal Rota System

THE NARRATIVE

The Royal Rota is a neutral press-pool arrangement that ensures fair media access to royal engagements where space and security are limited.

THE COUNTER-EVIDENCE

Critics describe the rota as an access-trading system. Outlets that rely on official photo calls, briefings and credentials have strong incentives not to bite the hand that feeds them. Prince Harry has called it an “invisible contract”: access in exchange for favourable coverage. The result, critics argue, is a press that favours personal drama over scrutiny of finances and attacks royal “renegades” who break ranks.

FACT-CHECK NOTE

The original draft described the rota as a deal with tabloids only. In fact it is a pool system run by the News Media Association, and its core print members (as of 2020) included the Daily Express, Daily Mail, Daily Mirror, Evening Standard, The Telegraph, The Times and The Sun. The PA news agency and broadcasters also take part. Members must share pooled material with others free of charge.

The claim that access is withdrawn for critical coverage is an allegation — made most prominently by the Duke and Duchess of Sussex, who quit the rota in 2020 — rather than a documented rule. Rota journalists and the National Union of Journalists defended the system as imperfect but necessary for covering a publicly funded institution.

The “Hard-Working Public Servants” Narrative

THE NARRATIVE

The royal family carries out thousands of official engagements each year, recorded in the Court Circular, as proof of a gruelling life of public service.

THE COUNTER-EVIDENCE

An “engagement” can be a brief handshake, a guestbook signature or a ribbon-cutting. Counting them gives a large number that royal commentators can repeat, framing inherited privilege as a demanding job. The metric measures appearances, not outcomes.

FACT-CHECK NOTE

The Court Circular does record official engagements, and engagements vary widely in length and substance. Counts are therefore a weak measure of workload in either direction. The specific “15-minute” example is illustrative rather than drawn from a published audit.

The Commonwealth “Family of Nations”

THE NARRATIVE

The Commonwealth is a voluntary fraternity of equal nations, with the monarch as a unifying figure above politics.

THE COUNTER-EVIDENCE

Critics see this as a rebranding of empire. Casting the monarch as a parental figure to former colonies softens imperial history and downplays the Crown's direct financial ties to the transatlantic slave trade, while sidestepping growing calls for reparations and republican status across the Caribbean.

FACT-CHECK NOTE

Confirmed. In April 2023 the Guardian published an archive document, found by historian Brooke Newman, recording the transfer of £1,000 of shares in the Royal African Company to William III in 1689, signed by the slave trader Edward Colston. William III then served as the company's governor.

Buckingham Palace responded that King Charles takes the issue profoundly seriously and supports an independent research project into the monarchy's links to slavery, with access to the Royal Collection and Royal Archives. Charles remains head of state of several Caribbean realms, including Jamaica and the Bahamas, where calls for apology and reparations continue.

CHAPTER 4

Legal Myths and Special Protections

Myth: “Royals Are Subject to the Same Laws as Everyone Else”

THE NARRATIVE

Britain lives under the rule of law, and no one — not even the King — is above it.

THE COUNTER-EVIDENCE

The reigning monarch enjoys sovereign immunity from civil suits and criminal prosecution. Beyond that, the royal household has negotiated exemptions from laws that bind every other employer.

FACT-CHECK NOTE

Partly confirmed, partly overstated. In 2021 the Guardian found National Archives papers showing that courtiers in 1968 said it was not the practice to appoint ethnic-minority people to clerical roles in the household, and that the Palace negotiated exemptions from the 1970s race and sex discrimination laws. Those exemptions persist: complaints from household staff go to a separate process rather than the courts.

The Palace says the household complies with the Equality Act 2010 “in principle and in practice.” The original draft’s broader claim of explicit exemptions from environmental and safety codes generally is not established by these sources; under the long-standing principle of Crown immunity, statutes do not bind the Crown unless they say so, which is a different and more general mechanism.

CHAPTER 5

The Propaganda Matrix

Taken together, these narratives form a system. Each one answers a different objection to monarchy, and each relies on a mechanism that keeps the answer in circulation.

Propaganda vector	Systemic function (as critics argue)
Royal Rota system	Shapes press coverage through access to official engagements
Tourism economic claim	Supplies a financial justification for public funding
King's Consent vetting	Gives private advance sight of laws touching royal interests
“Neutral arbiter” myth	Masks the institution's own class and property interests
Commonwealth branding	Softens the imperial legacy and links to slavery

CHAPTER 6

The Case for the Crown: Counterpoints

A fair reckoning has to hear the other side. Defenders of the monarchy make several arguments that this book's critique must answer.

Cost is a matter of accounting. Much of Republic's £510 million figure depends on security estimates that are not published and on treating palaces as if they could be rented out. Any head of state needs protection and an official residence; the relevant question is the marginal cost of a monarchy over an elected presidency, which is far smaller and genuinely hard to measure.

Consent is formal, and Parliament decides. The Palace and some constitutional scholars stress that Parliament, not the royal household, decides when Consent is needed, that it is always granted when ministers request it, and that the royal household's influence may be no greater than that of many other well-connected interests.

Restraint is the point. Monarchists argue that a head of state who does not intervene — as in 2019 — keeps the Crown out of partisan conflict and leaves disputes to Parliament and the courts. A politicised president, they say, could do more harm than a powerless monarch.

Soft power and continuity. Supporters point to the monarchy's role in diplomacy, state visits, charitable patronage and national ceremony, and to consistently majority support in British opinion polls, although support is markedly lower among younger people.

The institution is acknowledging its past. King Charles has expressed sorrow over slavery and opened the royal archives to independent research

— steps critics regard as insufficient, but which supporters cite as evidence of reform.

Readers who find the critique persuasive should still test it against these replies; those who find the replies persuasive should ask whether they answer the documentary record set out in the fact-check notes. The empirical questions — true cost, tourism effects, the reach of Consent — remain open, and better data would serve both sides.

Sources

Gov.uk, “Sovereign Grant Act 2011: guidance” and “Sovereign Grant recalculated as offshore wind profits rise” (20 July 2023).

The Crown Estate, “FAQs” (thecrownestate.co.uk/about-us/faqs).

AFP via eNCA, “How the British royal family is funded, and where the money goes.”

PA Media via Express & Star / Shropshire Star, “Royal family costs taxpayers ‘half a billion a year’, claim anti-monarchists.”

ITV News, “How much does the Royal Family cost?” (24 September 2024).

Ross Clark, “Would scrapping the monarchy really save us money?” *The Spectator*.

Guardian investigation into Queen's consent (February 2021 onward), as reported by Express & Star, Legal Cheek and Left Foot Forward; Guardian/Observer on Scottish crown consent.

Guardian reporting on royal household hiring and discrimination-law exemptions (2 June 2021), via AFP, Jamaica Observer and theGrio.

Channel 4 News, “Prince Charles ‘black spider’ letters released” (13 May 2015); *R (Evans) v Attorney General* [2015] UKSC 21.

R (Miller) v Prime Minister; *Cherry v Advocate General for Scotland* [2019] UKSC 41, as summarised by Greenberg Traurig and Fortune.

CNN and Reuters, “King Charles supports research into British monarchy's slavery links” (6 April 2023).

News Media Association, “Royal Rota”; Press Gazette on the Sussexes' withdrawal from the rota (January 2020); Wikipedia, “Royal Rota.”

Statista, “Tourism in Paris”; Daily Passport, “Top 10 Most-Visited Attractions in Europe” (2024).