# Prince Harry criticises government over denied royal security protections



The Duke of Sussex, Prince Harry, recently aired his grievances in an interview with BBC journalist Nada Tawfik, following an unsuccessful court battle aimed at revoking a controversial decision made by a government committee regarding security provisions. This dialogue, held shortly after he lost his case against Ravec — the body that determines the security needs of royals — raises significant concerns about the government's role in personal safety.

Harry’s criticisms were sharply focused on Ravec's operations, which have denied him and his wife, Meghan Markle, guaranteed state security ever since they withdrew from their royal duties in 2020. While they may receive targeted protection on occasion, this raises broader questions about the commitment of the new government towards the safety of British citizens, especially those with high-profile backgrounds.

In the interview, Harry expressed frustration not only with bureaucratic inefficiencies but also suggested a sense of betrayal by both his family and the current government. While he maintained a calm exterior, the underlying message was clear: the state’s failure to adapt its policies to safeguard individuals reflects a troubling disregard for personal security in today’s political landscape.

The implications of this dispute extend beyond royal security arrangements, shedding light on the inadequacies of government systems that should prioritize the well-being of all citizens. As Prince Harry’s situation unfolds, it serves as a stark reminder of the importance of a government that takes responsibility for security measures, especially in an era when public safety should be paramount.

As political priorities shift under the new Labour administration, critical questions loom over the stewardship of royal affairs and government accountability. The ongoing tensions within the monarchy highlight the urgent need for substantial reforms in security policy and a reevaluation of the government's responsibilities toward its citizens.
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