

Ottoman Empire, which once controlled the whole peninsula. A Croatian source predicted: "Turkey has abandoned Bosnia, but will draw the line in the southern Balkans." Of course, this would be a Turkey which had lost all claim to national dignity, and become a mere pawn in the hands of the Anglo-American oligarchy.

The trigger for a Balkan war may be the Kosova province in Serbia, which in the Yugoslav federation was an autonomous province because the majority of the population are ethnic Albanians. Serbian repression has made Kosova into a social tinderbox. So far, it has not turned into a war zone primarily because of Dr. Ibrahim Rugova, the moral leader of the Kosova Albanians, who has waged a non-violent struggle for rights in the footsteps of the American civil rights hero, Dr. Martin Luther King. Dr. Rugova's tactics have frustrated the leadership in the Serbian capital, Belgrade, which is itching for a pretext to repeat in Kosova the "ethnic cleansing" of non-Serbs conducted in Bosnia through mass murder and expulsions.

Under heavy Serbian provocation, resistance may not remain non-violent. Kosova by mid-November had become tenser than at any time since the bloody eruptions in March 1981, when scores were killed. If war breaks out in Kosova, it will tend to draw in the two bordering states: Albania, for obvious reasons, and the Republic of Macedonia, which has a 25% ethnic Albanian minority.

Once that occurs, the likelihood is high that every other Balkan state—Greece, Bulgaria, Turkey, even Romania—will be in the fray, each allied with what it sees as "the enemy of my enemy." Turkey on Nov. 19 concluded its second military pact with Albania this year, when Defense Minister Nevzat Ayaz visited Tirana. It commits Turkey to fight with Albania in any conflict with Serbia. Following the pattern of past Balkan wars, Bulgaria would invade the Republic of Macedonia to prevent a southward extension of Greater Serbia. Greece would view as a vital threat the combination of a Turkish military presence on its northern border, and Bulgaria's expansion into Macedonia, and ally openly with Serbia. It has already done so de facto, witness the Greek government's role in preventing recognition of Macedonia's independence.

At the higher, geo-strategic level, this scenario includes an Anglo-American design to install Turkey as the dominant regional satrapy. Greece, Bulgaria, Macedonia, Albania, and for that matter, Serbia, too, would slaughter one another, and Turkey eventually could pick up the pieces. While Turkish Prime Minister Suleyman Demirel was in London on Nov. 22-24 for talks with John Major on the Balkan crisis, Turkish military officials were holding secret talks in Sofia, Bulgaria. On Nov. 24, the German daily *Frankfurter Rundschau*, citing "western intelligence agencies," reported that the Turks demanded transit rights for Turkish forces across Bulgaria into the Republic of Macedonia and Albania when war breaks out.

Was Windsor Castle fire an act of God?

by Mark Burdman

Has a higher benevolent power happily decided that the era of the British House of Mountbatten-Windsor is coming to an end? Numerous telltale signs point to that conclusion.

In an unusually candid Nov. 24 declaration, Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II confessed to a City of London audience attending a lunch in her honor given by the Lord Mayor of London, that the year 1992, which is her 40th "jubilee" year as reigning monarch, was a "horrible year" for the royal family, rather than the year of celebration it was supposed to have been. It is very rare, in Britain, for the monarch to speak so openly about the royal family's tribulations.

A 'horrible year'

Waxing philosophical, the monarch characterized 1992 as "not a year on which I shall look back with undiluted pleasure. In the words of one of my more sympathetic correspondents, it has turned out to be an *annus horribilis*." According to the Nov. 25 *Daily Telegraph*, this reference, in Latin, to the horrible year, "raised many eyebrows" among those in the audience.

The statement was made against the backdrop of a new round of scandals centering on a reported extramarital affair of her eldest son and heir Prince Charles, the publicity about which has reached such a level in the continental European and British tabloid press, that there is now speculation that he may renounce his claim to the throne. Should this happen, one London insider affirmed, "this royal line would be doomed." The Charles scandal is the latest, in a year of scandals that have hit all of her brood.

Even worse, only four days before her City of London address, a major fire had broken out in Windsor Castle, the historic royal residence and frequent locale of state visits to the the United Kingdom. The fire raged for hours, and before it was brought under control, had caused tens of millions of dollars in damage to the royal premises. On hearing reports of what was going on at Windsor Castle, Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II rushed to the scene. Her son Andrew, Duke of York, told the press that his mother was "absolutely devastated." Prince Charles echoed this on Nov. 22: "It's a nightmare, and I keep hoping to wake up! The whole family was devastated."

Police, firefighters, and Buckingham Palace officials are adamantly excluding terrorism as a cause of the fire. The

official explanation is centering on a mistake made by a worker in the area of the castle's private chapel, which set the fire off.

'A dying, not a lasting, dynasty'

Be that as it may be, it is difficult to avoid finding a "metaphysical" explanation for the fire. The Nov. 22 *Independent on Sunday* editorialized on its front page that it detected an "ominous feeling that the Windsor fire is symptomatic of the country at large, that it stems from the new national characteristic of ineptitude. . . . Nothing seems to work as it used to: government, trains, banks, courts, the economy, the monarchy. Now even a royal palace blazes in the night. Fate frowns down."

The impression must be strong, indeed, that "an act of God" is ultimately involved in the fire, that that "higher power" has "spoken" against a monarchy which has perpetuated evil across the world, with its ostentatious personal greed, and—through the activities of both royal consort Prince Philip in his capacity as president of the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) and of "New Age" supporter Prince Charles—its open endorsement of pagan ecologism and vehement rejection of the Christian and Judaic heritage. (Interestingly, Philip was in Argentina, on a mission for the WWF on the day that the fire broke out at Windsor Castle.)

Among telltale signs, the following must be noted. One of the areas most damaged was the timber roof of St. George's Hall, which collapsed in the flames. This roof is studded with the heraldic shields of the super-exclusive Knights of the Garter. Knights of the so-called "Most Noble Order of the Garter," their numbers are restricted to 24. The order was founded in 1348. Its Sovereign is the queen.

Also, according to palace sources, the only painting of the many that had been in the area of the fire that was not salvaged, and which was irreparably destroyed, was a portrait of King George III, painted in the last years of the 18th century by Sir William Beechey. This King George III, of course, was the wretch against whose brutal looting policies the American War of Independence was launched in 1776. The portrait was, according to reports, a favorite of Queen Elizabeth II. George III himself abhorred the portrait, and fought, unsuccessfully, to have it destroyed. Almost two centuries later, but under circumstances that he would certainly view as perverse, his wish has been carried out.

There is a certain additional metaphorical aspect to George III going up in flames. Remember that the rallying cry of the American patriots in Boston was "no taxation without representation." What the Windsor Castle fire is bringing to the fore, is a curious parallel, in modern Britain, to that 18th-century fight. The British Conservative government has declared that the restoration of the castle must be done by public taxes, under an agreement signed in 1831 whereby the government, and not the royal family itself, has ultimate responsibility for preservation and upkeep of

Windsor Castle. This has brought cries of outrage from many Britons, since the queen is not obliged, under the British system, to pay any taxes at all, so is exempt from all financial responsibility for restoration of the damaged castle!

On Nov. 24, an angry *Daily Mail* editorial commented: "Why should the population, many of whom have had to make huge sacrifices during this bitter recession, have to pay the total bill for Windsor Castle when the queen, who pays no taxes, contributes next to nothing?" The same day's *Daily Mirror* accused the House of Mountbatten-Windsor of "sowing the seeds of its own destruction. . . . Meanness, greed, and blinkered disregard for the feelings of the people are the mark of a *dying, not a lasting, dynasty*" (emphasis added). The tabloid *Sun* released the findings of a poll, which showed that some 96% of those questioned believe that "the Queen should pick up the tab for the Windsor blaze."

As a concession, the queen has finally agreed to pay taxes on her vast fortune, thereby ending a 55-year tax exemption that had been arranged by her father King George VI in 1937. According to an announcement by Prime Minister John Major in the House of Commons on Nov. 26, she is to start paying income taxes on her private fortune and on certain other categories—although she still won't be coughing up for the reconstruction of Windsor Castle.

The wrath of God provoked?

For the British, the very figure of St. George has a great deal of symbolism, being the patron saint of the country. That a fire would destroy part of his "domain" at Windsor Castle, would cause enough of a shock. Additionally, annual commemorations of St. George are often occasions for proclamations of British cultural and philosophical outlook. On April 26, 1991, for example, with Prince Philip presiding, senior Crown representative Sir Crispin Tickell, former British ambassador to Mexico and then to the United Nations, delivered the "14th Annual St. George's House Lecture" at St. George's Chapel (not the same as the private chapel where the fire broke out) in which he abjured Christianity, and expressed his preference for the Mother-Earth Goddess, Satan's mother, Gaia (see below).

In a Nov. 22 statement on the background to the Windsor fire, former U.S. presidential candidate and *EIR* founding editor Lyndon LaRouche suggested that "the wrath of God" may have been provoked by that event, and that it were more useful to think in such terms of reference, than to speculate on what may have been the "instrumentality" for setting off the fire.

This matter of God's wrath, LaRouche proclaimed, "is not to be taken lightly. There are some things that cannot be readily explained, and one should not break one's neck, so to speak, attempting to explain them. Clarity may come in due course. The fact of the matter is, that this abomination, this worship of Satan's mother, the mother of Python, Gaia, of the Apollo-Delphi shrine, is an ideological, albeit reli-

gious, if you must, form of expression of a policy, a policy which is satanic in conception and effect; a policy sometimes called technological apartheid, of denying to the poorer people of the world, the means of maintaining their population; a policy which is typified by the criminality of certain Anglo-American interests in trying to prevent Germany from playing a leading role of a certain type in Europe, by means of such acts of prevention as unleashing the Serbian butchers against the former fellow citizens of the former Yugoslavia in the Balkans; which takes the form of food-growing set-asides at a time when the world is suffering food shortages on a scale of mass murderous famines."

LaRouche continued: "And unfortunately, the British royal family, through such agencies as the late Dicky Mountbatten and the prince consort and others, has once too often advocated the worship of Gaia and the imposition of her satanic policies of population control, explicitly and otherwise. It has played a leading role in such institutions as the World Wildlife Fund (now the World Wide Fund for Nature), Amnesty International, Greenpeace and so forth, in bringing about these satanic policies. Thus, the fiery destruction of the premises from which that obscenity has emanated, must be described as an act of God. With that, comes understanding."

Gaia-worship at Windsor Castle

Excerpts follow, from an article in EIR's Aug. 2, 1991 issue (Vol. 18, No. 29) entitled, "British Monarchy's Pagan Ecologism Endorsed by Group of Seven":

On April 26, [1991,] Prince Philip presided over a gathering at St. George's Chapel, St. George's House, Windsor Castle, the place where the royal family often worships. The "14th Annual St. George's House Lecture" was delivered on this occasion by Tickell. Mincing no words, Tickell attacked the Christian belief that "the world was created for the convenience of mankind" and that "God had created the world and given mankind dominion over it as laid down in Genesis." He expressed his preference for worship of the goddess Gaia: "The use of the word Gaia for the sum of the interlocking balancing mechanisms by which organisms perpetuate circumstances favorable to themselves had been considered romantic. *Personally I can think of few more worthy goddesses or objects of veneration.* . . .

"What then should be the model, paradigm, or philosophy to guide us? What mask of theory can we lay over the face of suffering nature? In devising it, no single element is more important than human population increase. This is the driving force behind both global warming and the destruction of bio-diversity. Unless such increase can be brought under control and then put into reverse, all efforts to restore stability to our environment will be in vain. I fear that if we do not do the job ourselves, nature may give us a helping hand, or worse do the job for us.

"A first step towards wisdom is to get rid of some illu-

sions. There is not the slightest prospect that living standards worldwide could rise to those of industrial countries. In that event, the carrying capacity of the Earth would be around 2.5 billion people.

"As the population rises to 8 or 10 or even 14 billion in the next century, let us remember the fate—or perhaps the parable—of Easter Island in the Pacific over about 1,000 years. A handful of people arrived by boat; they multiplied; they cut down trees; they cultivated the land; they multiplied again; they divided into little nations; they fought each other over diminishing resources and deteriorating land; they cut down what remained of the trees; now they could not escape; they suffered a drastic decline in numbers and living standards; finally they achieved a miserable stability. By the time Captain Cook arrived at the end of the 18th century, he found the wreck of a society on an ecological ruin. . . .

"The price of sticking to our present systems of value and not adapting to new ones is intolerably high. So far, all past human civilizations have crashed. None over time has reached a well-regulated steady state with population in balance with natural resources. There is no reason to believe that ours is any different. Indeed current signs are to the contrary.

"For biologists a familiar experiment is that of the Petri plate. Petri plates are round dishes with transparent food on them disposed to allow the investigator to see colonies of microbes with the naked eye. From small beginnings, the microbes multiply at an accelerating rate. They are at their most prolific as they reach the edge of the plate. Then the food runs out, the microbes die in their multibillions, and extinction takes place."

In his address, Tickell praised Thomas Malthus as a "heretic" who differed from other economists because he did not believe that "resource problems" could always be solved. Tickell said: "Once again the frame is flawed. But this time there is widespread awareness of it. People may not fully understand what is happening, but they know something has gone wrong. The last 20 years has seen mounting anxiety. Milestones were the Club of Rome report in 1970; the United Nations Conference on the Environment of 1972, followed by the creation of the United Nations Environment Program; the First World Climate Conference in 1979; the Vienna Convention on ozone depletion in 1985; and most important in terms of world opinion, the Brundtland Commission Report on Environment and Development in 1987.

"Since then the pace has quickened with successive declarations from the Economic Summit of the seven main industrial countries, the Commonwealth, and the Non-Aligned Movement; debates in the U.N. General Assembly; the reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and a Panel of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences; the Second World Climate Conference of last autumn; and now the countdown to the World Conference on Environment and Development in Brazil in June 1992."