

favor of a Greater Serbia, which flourished particularly during the Mitterrand years. Prince Alexander of Yugoslavia, the GLNF's number-three, is of the Karageorgevic royal line. Living today in exile in France, Prince Alexander is a central figure in a support network for Greater Serbian geopolitical ambitions.

Should the British and certain French interests choose to activate a "monarchy card" for Serbia, to replace the current gangster clique in Belgrade, the Paris-based Alexander will play a key role. The formal claimant is the London-based Crown Prince Alexander, the grandson of King Alexander of Yugoslavia, who was assassinated in 1934, and son of Yugoslavia's last king, Peter. But the crown prince, despite his connections to the British Crown and to corrupted pro-British circles in Washington, blew his chances for ascending to the throne, when he was outflanked by Serbian strongman Slobodan Milosevic in power intrigues in late 1991.

The Paris-based Alexander is referred to by the Duke of Kent as "His Royal Highness." Balkans experts believe that the British and relevant French interests now prefer to play their "Serbia monarchy card" through him, rather than through the washed-up crown prince in London. The Paris-based Alexander's "claim" is that his father, Prince Paul, served as the prince-regent of Yugoslavia when the king was assassinated in 1934. Paul ruled until 1941. While overthrown by the British after making a deal with Hitler, and then interned by the British, Paul later became a raving Anglophile. He married into the Russian noble Demidov family, a fact of some relevance to Alexander's recent activities.

The clan of this Paris-based Alexander is very active in promoting the Greater Serbia cause. His relative, Tomislav, has highest-level connections among Russian right-wing nationalists of the "Third Rome," imperialist variety, and to corresponding factions in the Russian Orthodox Church. Since at least the early 1990s, Tomislav has been involved in efforts to revive a "Serbo-Russian Society." On Aug. 12, 1991, the London *Guardian* reported that, in a visit to Moscow, Tomislav had won Russian backing for the restoration of the monarchy in Belgrade. Soon before that, Tomislav's wife, the Sussex, U.K.-born Princess Lynda, had returned from Belgrade, where her royal party was cheered by crowds in the streets. Alexander's sister, Elizabeth, who lives in New York, is also a big organizer for Greater Serbian causes.

Alexander's wife is Maria Pia de Savoy, the eldest daughter of the late King Umberto II of Savoy, the claimant to the Italian throne. Alexander's brother-in-law is Robert Zellinger de Balkany, a leading figure in the French branch of the 1001 Nature Trust, the fundraising arm of Prince Philip's World Wide Fund for Nature.

When it is kept in mind that Roland Dumas, while serving as Mitterrand's foreign minister, was an outspoken defender of the Serbian cause, the dimensions of what is involved in *L'Événement du Jeudi's* freemasonic intrigue begin to become clear.

Prince Philip fiddles, while monarchy bums

by Scott Thompson

His Royal Highness Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, visited the United States March 12-15, traveling to New York, Washington, D.C., and Palm Beach, Florida. According to an aide, this is Prince Philip's "swan song" as president of the World Wide Fund for Nature. He is scheduled to retire in June, to concentrate upon his Alliance of Religion and Conservation (ARC), which is seeking to transform nine major religions into worship of the Earth Mother goddess, Gaia.

But while the Royal Consort cavorted in the United States, all was not well with the House of Windsor.

Prince Philip's trip was an opportunity to pick up loot for his Duke of Edinburgh Award International Foundation (DEAIF), for "youth leadership." He spent more than two days in New York City raising money for DEAIF, at private breakfasts, a lunch at Sotheby's auction house, a reception at the New York Yacht Club, and private meetings with the officials of Lehman Brothers.

On March 14, he traveled to Washington, D.C., where he raised funds for the DEAIF's American counterpart, the Congressional Award Foundation. He lunched at the hilltop mansion of Arianna Huffington, the "copper-plated" airhead who runs a salon for Conservative Revolutionaries. Entry to the luncheon for 16 people cost \$20-75,000. That evening, after a reception at the British ambassador's residence, Philip pocketed more loot from a \$500-and-up-per-plate dinner at the Corcoran Gallery. Honorary co-chairmen of the dinner were the leaders of the House and Senate. Honorary chairmen included 30 ambassadors to the United States and 200 congressmen.

Call to abolish the monarchy

Meanwhile, British Labour Party leader Anthony Wedgwood Benn informed *EIR* that he had reintroduced into the British Parliament a bill for abolition of the monarchy and the transformation of Britain into a constitutional republic. Benn said that he does not expect the bill to pass this time around, although a majority of British powerbrokers now favor some sort of reform, but that it will do so with the succession crisis upon the death of Queen Elizabeth II. The bill is an indication of the biggest brawl in centuries over the future of the British monarchy—just as Lyndon LaRouche predicted over a year

ago in *EIR's Special Report* "The Coming Fall of the House of Windsor."

Among the key provisions of the bill are these:

- It would "establish a democratic, federal, and secular Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Wales dedicated to the welfare of all its citizens."

- It would "provide for a Constitution and for Constitutional amendment," and there would be a "Charter of Rights." "Before its introduction, the new Constitution would have to be put to the electors in a national referendum, and a choice of the electoral system to be adopted would be included in that referendum."

- "The Constitutional status of the Crown and the House of Lords would end, and the Privy Council would be abolished. Members of the Royal Family would enjoy all the rights of citizenship, including the right to stand for Parliament, and would receive pensions and accommodation."

- The bill would "establish a Commonwealth Parliament consisting of the House of Commons and the House of the People" (an elected, upper chamber).

- The bill would "establish the office of President, and a Council of State, and prescribe the powers of each."

- The bill would "set up national Parliaments for England, Scotland, and Wales."

- It would "disestablish the Church of England . . . and provide for equality under law of all religions and beliefs."

- "There would be a High Court, and provision for the confirmation of Judges and the election of Magistrates."

- "British jurisdiction over Northern Ireland would be terminated," and it would be free to reunite with Ireland.

- The bill would "amend the law relating to official information," and there would be provision "for an annual report to Parliament by the Security Services."

Other forces at play

Apart from those like Benn, who have staked out a maximum position calling for a written constitution and abolition of the monarchy, there are many factions of so-called "republicans" in Britain, including those secretly backed by the Club of the Isles—the European-wide grouping of monarchs and other aristocrats. For example, Stephen Haseler's right-wing "Republican Society" is in part a gambit of the Rothschild family.

Tony Benn identified several such "New Republicans" in a June 9, 1992 article in the *Guardian*, and in conversation with *EIR*. Benn believes that almost the entirety of the City of London financial center favors limiting the power of the monarchy, because it has come to be an impediment to closer alliance with the European Union, from which profits stand to be made.

Benn has considerable standing in the Labour Party. He has been elected to 16 terms in the House of Commons, and has served both as Labour Party chairman and as a cabinet minister in every Labour government. He was disqualified

from Parliament in 1960, upon the death of his father, Lord Stansgate, which elevated him to the House of Lords, and it took him three years to successfully fight the peerage law and renounce his title, to take his position in the House of Commons once again.

Tony Blair kicks over the anthill

On the other hand, Labour Party Leader Tony Blair has no desire at this time to challenge the monarchy. His primary goal is to unseat the Conservatives in the upcoming elections. In his John Smith Memorial Lecture in London on Feb. 7, Blair called for an end to the hereditary principle of voting in the House of Lords, which, according to Benn, brought into question the hereditary legitimacy of the monarchy, without Blair's intending to do so. Said Blair:

"Are we going to continue, alone of all the democracies, to continue to have laws passed by an Upper Chamber, a majority of whose members are there by birth, not merit, perhaps because 300 years ago their ancestor was the mistress of a monarch? . . .

"Perhaps the oddest and least defensible part of the British Constitution is the power wielded by hereditary peers in the House of Lords. Today the Conservative Party have placed their colors firmly on the territory of no change here either—though I believe some of the more enlightened Conservatives, even those in the Lords, will disagree.

"The case for reform is simple and obvious. It is in principle wrong and absurd that people should wield power on the basis of birth, not merit or election. What is more, there are over 300 official Tory hereditary peers, 12 Labour and 24 Liberal Democrat. . . .

"At the moment, the House of Lords is an unelected body, but it is both unelected and with membership predominantly based on birth, not merit.

"Whatever the final balance between election and merit, it is impossible to justify doing nothing about a manifest constitutional unfairness, namely, membership of the legislature on the basis of birth. Surely we should first make the House of Lords a genuine body of the distinguished and meritorious—with a better, more open and independent means of establishing membership—and then debate how we incorporate democratic accountability."

As Benn points out, this is far from a call for an elected upper house, but it "kicked over the anthill."

Another major development was reported by the *New York Times* on March 9. For centuries, it has been taboo for the British royal family to be discussed in Parliament. However, on March 5, Speaker of the House of Commons Betty Boothroyd said that there was nothing to prevent a full debate about the abolition of the monarchy, if the government and opposition chose to have one.

It is unlikely, however, that Prime Minister John Major would agree, and Tony Blair is also unlikely to support such a debate at this time.