

ratism, Milosevic added: "Mostly children have paid the price, and not those who led the counterrevolution." He underscored that solving the Kosovo crisis "has absolute priority," along with constitutional changes "without delay" that would give Serbia direct rule over Kosovo.

The Serbian Party Conference concluded with a demand that an extraordinary Federal Party Congress be convened soon, to ratify constitutional changes giving Serbia direct rule over Kosovo and Vojvodina, and increasing central—read, Serbian—power, at the expense of the other republics, notably Slovenia and Croatia. The Serbians are also demanding that the extraordinary Party Congress conduct a purge of non-Serbian party leaders and institute "drastic cuts" in the federal party bureaucracy.

### The ethnic tinderbox

In Kosovo itself, tensions have been rising each day since Nov. 18. The ban imposed on Albanian demonstrations by the nine-member Yugoslav Federal State Presidium, first on Nov. 20, was ignored for three days by the Albanian inhabitants of the region, before finally, on Nov. 23, a temporary and deceptive "lull" set in.

Only a miracle has prevented violent clashes between Albanians and Serbs in Kosovo, so far. For example, Nov. 21, a core group of 4,000 Albanian workers marched some 45 miles to Kosovo's capital, Pristina, to protest the forced resignation of the local Albanian party leadership. In Pristina, they were joined by thousands of others and all marched through the Serbian suburb of Kosovo, Polje. Only a heavy police escort prevented otherwise certain violence.

The ethnic conflict is now spreading. On Nov. 22, at least 15,000 Slovenians demonstrated in their capital of Ljubljana, to protest the constitutional changes Serbia is demanding. In Croatia, Yugoslavia's other western republic, the leading daily *Vjesnik*, on the same day, carried a front-page editorial blasting Serbia for wanting "to force others to bend to its will," and asked: "With what right are the demands coming out of Serbia for the resignation of numerous political leaders in other regions?" Serbia was accused of a "double standard" in praising Serbian rallies, while condemning Albanians who demonstrate as engaged in "subversive political demonstrations." *Vjesnik* concluded by noting that "it is almost as if with regret" that the Serbian press mentions that "so far" no violence has occurred during the Albanian demonstrations.

The lack of bloodshed will not last for long. The key to propelling Milosevic further on the road to power, and thus bringing Yugoslavia to the point of open fragmentation, lies in setting up violent incidents in Kosovo. Moscow has many assets among the extremist nationalists, both Albanian and Serbian, and can be expected to employ them to effect the next turning point in Russia's favor. The Serbian drive is but a prelude; the real power play is Moscow's open bid to dominate the entire Balkan peninsula, by sometime during 1989 at the latest.

## Thatcher aborts royal plot with Kremlin

by Mark Burdman

Over the Nov. 18-20 weekend, British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's office at 10 Downing Street took some preemptive measures against a nasty deal shaping up between the Kremlin and Buckingham Palace.

In the days prior, the Kremlin had caused a report to be circulated in the British press, that Mikhail Gorbachov, during his Dec. 12-14 visit to London, would be bringing with him an invitation for Queen Elizabeth II to visit Moscow. This invitation would be extended, at a Dec. 14 meeting between Gorbachov and the Queen at Buckingham Palace, according to the reports leaked by the Kremlin to chosen British conduits.

But on Nov. 18, in a background press briefing, an aide to Mrs. Thatcher let it be known that the British prime minister would advise against any royal family visit to the Soviet Union. Since, under British constitutional arrangements, the monarchy is bound to remain out of political affairs, such counsel from the prime minister would amount to an effective veto, unless the Palace were prepared to initiate a confrontation that could rapidly escalate into a constitutional crisis.

Reporting this story, the Nov. 20 *Sunday Times* of London commented that the Soviets had leaked the story of the invitation to the Windsors "to test British reaction before a formal invitation was issued. . . . The Kremlin has had its answer in unmistakable terms with this preemptive veto."

### Against the 'Russian party'

The pretext cited for 10 Downing Street's decision is that it would be inappropriate for the Queen to visit a Bolshevik regime, since the Bolsheviks murdered leading members of the Romanov dynasty, who were relatives of the House of Windsor in Britain. This, in and of itself, would hardly be an insurmountable obstacle. As British newspapers pointed out, King George V himself took measures to prevent safe exile for his cousin, Czar Nicholas II, and was, to some extent, complicit in the deaths of the Romanovs.

If that fact only hints at high-level British Establishment support for the Bolsheviks, it points to the core issue behind

Mrs. Thatcher's preemptive veto. The monarchy, by and large, represents the "pro-Russian party" inside Britain.

Hence, while the late Lord Mountbatten might have invoked "family outrage" for the Bolsheviks' murder of his royal relatives as the reason for boycotting a dinner for visiting Soviet Prime Minister Aleksei Kosygin in the early 1970s, the same Mountbatten was a self-professed socialist and Soviet sympathizer. He brought KGB-linked petroleum magnate Armand Hammer into the inner sanctums of the monarchy, to the point that Hammer is today one of the trusted friends and advisers of Mountbatten's protégé, Prince Charles.

Likewise, the Church of England leadership, under the Queen's appointee Archbishop of Canterbury Robert Runcie, has taken an overtly pro-Russian view in the past years, all the more damning of Buckingham Palace since the Queen is the formal head of the Church. The same "Russian party" problem is indicated in the story of Anthony Blunt, the "fourth man" linked to the Philby-Burgess-Maclean Soviet spy ring, who was at one time special art adviser to Buckingham Palace, and who carried out at least one important spy mission on behalf of the royal family.

In whatever way Mrs. Thatcher understands the threat the "pro-Russian party" poses to Great Britain and the West, she is acting to abort the Windsor-Kremlin axis. What the public will be told, as the Nov. 20 *Sunday Times* phrased it, is that Mrs. Thatcher believes that a state visit by the Queen "would give Gorbachov a propaganda coup which would weaken the West's efforts to press for faster progress towards political freedom in Russia." Other papers said that Thatcher is angry about Soviet human rights violations, and would regard a visit by the Queen to Moscow as "an endorsement of Kremlin policy."

Mrs. Thatcher is expressing the caution of a certain faction of the Western elite toward the Soviets. She may, indeed, have told *Washington Post* and *Newsweek* editors, during her mid-November trip to the United States, that Gorbachov's policies had effectively "ended the Cold War." However, London insiders inform *EIR* that such odd statements are counterbalanced by briefings she has received from British military sources that the Soviets have recently been doubling the warheads on their SS-18/Mod-5 intercontinental ballistic missiles targeting the United States, and have thereby greatly increased their offensive capabilities against the West.

### Outrage from the palace

One can be sure that the Queen and her entourage are seething, especially because there was unquestionably some behind-the-scenes plotting going on.

The Nov. 20 *Sunday Mail* of London reported that when the Kremlin originally "signalled" its intent to invite the Queen, the invitation had been "welcomed by Buckingham Palace." The paper fretted that 10 Downing Street's action could "jeopardize the trip" of Gorbachov to London, if the

Soviets regard Mrs. Thatcher's action as a "diplomatic snub."

The *Sunday Times* commented that the Queen "is known to be fascinated by the Gorbachov phenomenon," and is likely to be "disappointed" by the Thatcher government's opposition to her visit. The paper claims that Her Majesty "receives copies of all Foreign Office telegrams and is said to question all those who have met the Russian leader. Other members of the royal family have visited the Soviet Union in a private capacity. The Princess Royal attended a three-day eventing competition in Kiev in 1973 and Prince Philip visited Moscow in 1979 as president of the International Equestrian Federation."

Since the news of Thatcher's decision to "veto" the trip, the prime minister has been subjected to a range of absurd, if also revealing, attacks. Lord St. John of Fawsley, a former cabinet minister and personal friend of the royal family, said, "I think the Queen would love to go to the Soviet Union. She has great curiosity and loves to travel to new places and enjoy new experiences. . . . I personally think such a visit would help ensure that Mr. Gorbachov survives and succeeds, and that is essential."

From the Labour Party, foreign affairs spokesman George Robertson accused Mrs. Thatcher, whom he dubbed "Queen Margaret," of acting out of motives of "envy," wanting to maintain a monopoly on international diplomacy and on contacts with the Russians. Said Robertson, "I think it is in the country's interest that the Queen should visit the Soviet Union."

Perhaps the most absurd of all is the *Sunday Express's* columnist, Sir John Junor, who wrote, "Of course, a royal visit to Moscow would be an enormous propaganda coup for Mr. Gorbachov. But what would be wrong with that? Don't we want to sustain Mr. Gorbachov in power? And, besides, wouldn't it have been an even bigger coup for the Queen? Might she not, just for once, have even upstaged Mrs. Thatcher?"

The British Foreign and Commonwealth Office is taking a more restrained, if equally bitter view. One FCO source told the liberal *Observer* Nov. 20, "From a political point of view, there would be quite a lot of merit in a royal trip." When asked by the *Guardian* Nov. 21 what he thought of Mrs. Thatcher's action, Foreign Secretary Sir Geoffrey Howe huffily deferred all questions on the matter, indicating that he had not been consulted and was angry at 10 Downing Street.

The Russians, too, may have already expressed "disapproval" of Mrs. Thatcher's decision. On Nov. 20, the Irish Republican Army bombing campaign against the British military was renewed, with eight soldiers injured in a blast near an Army barracks in Belfast. The Nov. 21 *Times* of London reported a military alert over an imminent "terror blitz" by IRA recruitstrained and supplied by Libya. In the past weeks, Soviet officials have on more than one occasion attacked Thatcher government policy in Northern Ireland, and signalled public support for their "irregular warfare" assets there.