

Great Britain strives to restore monarchies in Balkans—and beyond

by Mark Burdman

The British Establishment is rushing headlong to realize its project for imposing monarchies in various crisis-torn countries around the world, beginning with the Balkans royal houses, which comprise a crucial part of what the British refer to as the “extended family” of Queen Victoria. This project, which became operational in the summer-autumn of 1991 as the war against Croatia and Slovenia escalated and London maneuvered to bring the Serbian House of Karageorgevic back into power in Belgrade, dramatically escalated this spring, with the focus in Romania and Bulgaria, and extending outward from there.

As various British experts in social engineering have recently been stressing to *EIR*, we are now living in a period of economic breakdown and extreme social volatility, in which people’s fears can be played upon to manipulate them into accepting new forms of tyranny. Driven to desperation, and seeming to have no alternative program that would guarantee economic growth and scientific progress under republican forms of representative self-government, frightened people become susceptible to ceremonies and historical symbols that appeal to the infantile side of human nature, and which reinforce their dependency on what are advertised as “tradition-oriented” state structures.

In the Balkans, a deep demoralization has set in since the 1989-90 overthrow of the communist regimes. The same Anglo-American elites who are sponsoring the monarchical restorations, have insisted that the economies of Bulgaria, Romania, Albania, etc., be subjected to an International Monetary Fund (IMF)-fashioned “structural adjustment” policy—so as to replace the communist tyrannies that ruled from the late 1940s to the late 1980s with the tyranny of the IMF. As one Romanian economist opposed to the IMF asserted plaintively at a conference in Germany in April, the “IMF reform program” was instituted by the current (largely communist) regime in Bucharest “without any democratic discussion whatsoever.” Romania, she warned, was threatened with a new form of “neo-colonialism.”

The strategic-financial gamemasters in London and New York lure the targeted people into believing that, should they put monarchs into power, these monarchs, with their wonderful international connections, will bring money into the empty coffers of the national treasuries. The real agenda is exactly the opposite: The monarchs are assigned the job

of sucking more loot out of the nations concerned, while convincing the citizens that this is being done for the higher purpose of “restoring the history and tradition” of the country robbed of its history and tradition by communism.

The return of King Michael

Romania is in the vanguard of the British-orchestrated monarchies program. Over the April 25-27 weekend, exiled King Michael of the Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen royal house returned to Romania for the first time since he was forced to abdicate in 1947. He arrived at the invitation of Romanian Orthodox Church Archbishop Pimen of Suceava, and with the agreement of the Romanian government.

Upon arrival, he visited two important historical sites, the Putna monastery and the shrine of St. Stephen. The next day, April 26, was the Orthodox Easter Sunday, and Michael went on to Bucharest. The April 27 London *Times* headlined its coverage, “Bucharest Hails Its Former Monarch,” reporting that as the exiled King “drove triumphantly through the Romanian capital,” more than 100,000 supporters lined the route, shouting, “King in, Iliescu out!” The *Times* then all but likened Michael to Jesus Christ: “On a bright Orthodox Easter Sunday, he was resurrected from relative obscurity in Switzerland and hailed as the new leader of the country.” The paper’s correspondent waxed eloquent about weeping and cheering crowds, who were waving the national flag. In the middle of the flag was the symbol of the monarchy, the emblem on it reading, “Nothing without God.”

Of course, once the social-engineering experiment of his “resurrection” had been concluded, Michael of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen was ready to move toward the next step. On April 30, he was interviewed in the Italian daily *Corriere della Sera*, and declared that the current state system in Romania is “outside of the law.” He said that Romania should declare itself a constitutional monarchy, by reinstating the Romanian Constitution of 1923. Michael swore he would be the man to “abolish all communist state structures which still exist,” and to dismantle the current “half-dictatorship” which has stopped democracy “in the middle.” He implied that he had a deal with at least some of the powers-that-be, mooted that the currently ruling and communist-dominated National Salvation Front (NSF) could move in the direction of institutionalizing a constitutional monarchy, once it is reelected in

upcoming elections.

His path to power was then further smoothed by the NSF regime, when it announced that, effective May 1, large-scale price rises would go into effect for basic foodstuffs including bread, cooking oil, milk, butter, and others. The more misery, the more monarchists.

On a related front, the correspondent for the French daily *Le Monde* in neighboring Bulgaria commented April 28 that not only in Romania “but also in Sofia, the shadow of the ex-King looms large,” and that the idea of the restoration of the House of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha is still very much alive in Bulgaria. The paper reported that exiled King Simeon II, based in Madrid, has in the past weeks been receiving visits from various influentials. Most recently, in March, Ahmed Dogan, head of the Movement for Rights and Liberty, the party that speaks for Bulgaria’s Turkish ethnic population and which is closely linked to the Turkish government, made the pilgrimage to Madrid, and pronounced in favor of a “constitutional monarchy that would put an end to the struggle for hegemony between the three centers of power: Parliament, President, and government.” Earlier in the year, Bulgarian Prime Minister Filip Dimitrov met Simeon’s son-in-law during Dimitrov’s visit to Washington. Leading figures in the Parliament and in the trade union movement have also rallied behind Simeon.

Bulgaria, like Romania, has been subjected to an IMF structural adjustment program, with effects probably even more devastating than in Romania. European collaborators of Harvard University “shock therapy” guru Jeffrey Sachs have praised Bulgaria as the model to be followed by other formerly communist countries.

‘They ran states for lesser peoples’

The Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen and Saxe-Coburg-Gotha houses are multiply linked to the British House of Mountbatten-Windsor, known as the House of Hanover until the exigencies of World War I and the war with Germany forced a name-change. While many of these royal lines seem to have German lineages, they have effectively operated in the contemporary historical period as extensions of the British monarchy. In Romania, Michael’s grandmother was Queen Marie, a granddaughter of Queen Victoria, whose photographs from the time indicate a striking similarity to today’s Queen Elizabeth II. It was Marie who swung Romania behind Britain during World War I, despite the Germanic roots of the Hohenzollerns. As she wrote in a letter to Britain’s King George V soon after the war was over: “I can only tell you, dear George, that I held firm as only a born Englishwoman can. . . . I knew you would win, and I kept my people from giving way even at a moment when many had become doubters.”

Michael’s mother was Princess Helen of Greece. One scion of that same Greek royal house is Prince Philip, Royal Consort to Queen Elizabeth II. From his early years, Michael

was both a cousin and good friend of Philip and remains so today.

A pro-monarchist article in the London *Economist* April 25 stated shamelessly that the Hohenzollern (“a name that few history books omit”) and the Saxe-Coburgs, like the Romanovs of “Holy Russia” and the Karageorgevics of Serbia, “belong to the European cousinage that for centuries ran states for lesser peoples.”

Invoking the name “Romanov of Holy Russia” introduces another piece in the plot. The Romanov dynasty had close blood ties to the British House of Hanover, to the extent that photographs of Czar Nicholas II show him to have been a near lookalike of Britain’s King George V. The two were cousins, related on both the maternal and paternal sides of the family.

On April 28, St. Isaac’s Cathedral in St. Petersburg was the scene of the funeral for Grand Duke Vladimir Kirillovich Romanov, the chief claimant to the Romanov throne that was deposed by the Bolsheviks in 1917. The emotional ceremony was conducted by Patriarch Aleksii II, head of the Russian Orthodox Church, following a typical pattern in Orthodox countries of a close church-monarchy linkage. While a restoration of the monarchy in Russia is not predictable in the near term, it is hardly to be excluded as an option, as Russia goes through the chaos of its own IMF shock therapy program. Prince Philip, in recent years, has been building strong ties to the Orthodox churches of the East, in large part through his work as World Wide Fund for Nature head. As things stand now, he is scheduled to meet Russian Orthodox Church Patriarch Aleksii II in Russia in 1993. Should this transpire, he will be the first member of the British royal family to visit Russia since the Bolsheviks murdered the Windsor-related Romanovs.

The fact that the late Grand Duke Vladimir was married into the Georgian royal house of Bagratian introduces yet another component in the intricate web of monarchical relations. His wife, Leonilda, is the aunt of the current claimant to the Georgian throne, Jorge Bagratian, who lives in exile in Marbella, Spain. Since early this year, there have been several rounds of negotiations involving senior figures in the Georgian governing coalitions that have replaced ousted ruler Zviad Gamsakhurdia, with members of the exiled Bagratian royal house. Madrid and Rome have been the two main locales for such discussions, while highest-level figures in the British Establishment have been giving quiet encouragement to the monarchy restoration option there.

‘Rulers belong to Queen Victoria’s family’

British influentials are hardly being subtle about implementing precisely such plans. On April 30, the London *Daily Telegraph* published a lead article entitled “Time to Reconvene the Royal Family of Europe?” It explicitly advocated restoring “the family of Queen Victoria” to thrones in the Balkans nations. The article was authored by one Noel



Better than democracy? Virtually every royal family throughout Europe is related to the British monarchs. Here, a portrait of the current royal household.

Malcolm, foreign editor of *The Spectator*, a weekly magazine close to the Conservative Party.

The *Telegraph* and *The Spectator* are both owned by the Toronto-based Hollinger Corp., whose chief executive is Conrad Black. The Hollinger board of directors with the directorate of the Anglo-American establishment, including Henry A. Kissinger, former British Foreign Secretary Peter Lord Carrington, former U.S. Federal Reserve chairman Paul A. Volcker, Lord Jacob Rothschild, British billionaire Sir James Goldsmith, and others of that ilk.

Black himself is one of the key figures in both the Trilateral Commission and the Bilderberg Group. It may be more than coincidence that the barrage of fascism and monarchism propaganda has broken out immediately after the April 25-27 Trilateral get-together in Lisbon, and in the period preceding the May 21-24 Bilderberg meeting in Evian, France. Noticeable of the Lisbon meeting was the personnel overlap between Trilateral coordinators and Hollinger board members. The conference vice chairman, Allen Gottlieb, is on the Hollinger board, while one of the conference keynoters was Hollinger board member Kissinger, and the recently appointed chairman of the North American branch of the commission is Hollinger board member Volcker. Black was reportedly in attendance in Lisbon.

In his article, Malcolm criticized those who tend to dis-

miss the "monarchy restoration" option for the Balkans. Drawing attention to the estimated 100,000 Romanians shouting, "Give Us Back Our King!" when King Michael "returned" to Romania April 26, Malcolm insisted that, for such people, the monarchy is "the most important symbol of their pre-communist history."

With the usual British blend of cynicism, pragmatism, and brutality, Malcolm went on: "The idea of restoring the monarchies in these countries might still seem artificial and implausible; but it is no more so than their creation in the first place. And we should remember that those 19th-century princes were not enthroned as a whimsey. There were good reasons for installing them, reasons uncannily paralleled in the situation of those countries today. . . . Restoring their monarchies would not just encourage western investment; it would also mark in a psychologically important way their final break with communism. There can be no more fitting symbol of belonging to the 'family' of European nations than to have rulers who (like other European monarchs) belong literally to the family of Queen Victoria."

Monarchies then, and monarchies now, can "encourage the development of national feeling and culture." Besides, "the constitutional argument for monarchy is also no less strong today than it was when these monarchies were installed."

Of course, what Malcolm ignores is that the monarchies of the Balkans were more often than not hardly testaments of virtue and nobility of character. For example, the ancestors of the current Michael of Romania were characterized by moral depravity, political incompetence, and sexual and other forms of intrigue. His unstable father King Carol II was a supporter of the Nazis, and helped nurture the fascist Iron Guard formations in Romania.

In late April, the London *Economist* went beyond the Balkans, reporting a new "craving for kings," as "all over the world, politicians in tight corners are rediscovering the merits of monarchs." The magazine profiled ongoing restoration efforts, at various levels of intensity and seriousness, taking place in Afghanistan, Romania, Bulgaria, Russia, Serbia, France, Italy, Portugal, Greece, Libya, Ethiopia, Brazil, and Cambodia, and extolled the virtues of existing monarchies in Spain ("the Spanish Bourbons"), in Great Britain (with Queen Elizabeth "of Saxe-Coburg-Windsor and part Scottish too"), in various parts of the Muslim world, in Oceania, and in parts of non-Muslim Asia and Africa. "In high society, monarchs never went out of fashion," the London magazine proclaimed. "In real life, they seem to be making a comeback. . . . The monarchy business is ripe for expansion. Some families are already doing fine."

Hobbesians of all lands unite!

All of this is accompanied by a broader philosophical offensive, in which "monarchism" and "democracy" are given ultimately the same ideological underpinnings. When An-

glo-American neo-conservatives use the word "democracy," they mean something else than the benevolent concept that the average citizen would understand. British "parliamentary democracy," after all, is in essence a facade, a living theater, in which various formal parliamentary and electoral procedures provide the illusion of British subjects' participation in the decision-making system, but in which the actual options are decided by a tiny oligarchical clique, and in which the monarchy itself plays an all-pervasive political and liturgical-symbolic role.

A key aspect of the theater, is the mythology spread by British ideologues that one of the seminal "democratic" theorists was the 17th-century Thomas Hobbes of Britain. This myth is repeatedly purveyed, for example, in the recently published book of former U.S. State Department Policy Planning deputy director Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man*, one of the most widely discussed works in this year's European intellectuals' cocktail circuits, which was singled out for praise in a March London *Times* editorial. The central claim in Fukuyama's book is that "liberal democracy" of the Anglo-Saxon variety has irreversibly triumphed, philosophically and historically, over all competing systems of government.

Without offering one shred of evidence, Fukuyama asserts that Hobbes was one of the chief philosophical inspirations behind the American Constitution and in the thinking of the American Founding Fathers. Yet it is known to Fukuyama, and to all those who think like him, that Hobbes was one of modern history's most persistent theorists and defenders of absolute monarchy.

Hobbes's "original state of nature" and "war of each against all" is not abstract theorizing: it is the operational plan of the leading oligarchical factions today, who seek to drive most of the human race into a desperate fight for bare survival, so that they can impose a new "Leviathan," a Roman Empire-modeled world government, likely run out of the United Nations. From this standpoint, it is not surprising that the leading theoreticians of "Project Democracy" in the United States are all passionate Hobbesians.

Thus we find the National Endowment for Democracy, the "public-private" agency that funds Project Democracy's projects, concretely backing the monarchy-restoration project in the Balkans. As noted by the April 28 *Le Monde*, and as confirmed independently by Bulgarian sources in discussions with *EIR*, a chief supporter of bringing Simeon of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha to the throne is the head of the Podkrepa "independent" trade union movement, one Trenchev. According to the 1990 Annual Report of the National Endowment for Democracy, the NED gave two financial grants to Podkrepa, via an entity called the Free Trade Union Institute. One grant, for \$276,190, was to "provide material and technical support to Bulgaria's independent trade union movement Podkrepa," and the other, for \$51,024, was to "help Podkrepa organize a voter referendum campaign for the local elections."

Bosnia faces being wiped off the map

by Konstantin George

For the first time since World War II, a nation on the European continent, officially recognized by the European Community, is being subjected to partition and thereby to outright liquidation. This is the mixed ethnic former Yugoslav republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina (44% Bosnian Muslim, 32% Serb, 18% Croatian).

The Serbian war of aggression in April and the first half of May, has already achieved, on the ground, a de facto partition of Bosnia. By May 13, when a cynical "unilateral five-day cease-fire" was proclaimed by the "Parliament of Serbian Bosnia" from its "capital," the west Bosnian city of Banja Luka, the Serbian Armed Forces had conquered most of the 60% of Bosnia-Herzegovina that Serbia had intended to annex as the "Serbian Bosnian Republic." The Army had seized all of predominantly Muslim Eastern Bosnia, most of Northern Bosnia, with its mixed population of all three groups, all of Western Bosnia, which is predominantly Serbian inhabited, and parts of Herzegovina in the south. The Bosnian capital, Sarajevo, has become a war-ravaged divided city, a Balkan "Beirut." A further 20% of Bosnia-Herzegovina is controlled by ethnic Croatian self-defense units, leaving the Bosnian Muslims with the remaining 20%, a rump "state" in the geographical center of what had been Bosnia-Herzegovina.

At the local political level, the partition of Bosnia is occurring through an arrangement between Serbia and Croatian President Franjo Tudjman, the former communist and Partisan general, whereby Serbia will annex the regions it has conquered, and Croatia will receive the main Croatian-inhabited areas, meaning western Herzegovina, and areas in northern Bosnia adjacent to Croatian Slavonia.

A broad agreement along these lines was reached May 6 at secret talks held by the leaders of the Serbian and Croatian Bosnians, Radovan Karadzic and Franjo Boras, respectively, in the Austrian city of Graz. The deal was announced May 7 by the "Yugoslav" news agency, Tanjug. No one in either Zagreb or Belgrade denied it. Since then, both Serbian and Croatian media have been filled with "leaks" on the partition formula, ranging from a Serbian-Croatian-Bosnian Muslim division of 60-20-20, to 60-30-10. Again, no denials anywhere.

On May 5, as Karadzic and Boras were departing for Graz, Tudjman issued a declaration that Bosnia can "only remain a state" under conditions of a "complete cantonization," i.e., a thinly disguised partition. On May 8, Tudjman