

Yahoos don't tithe

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. analyzes the British Empire's reincarnation at the headquarters of the United Nations on New York City's East River.

A present-day Jonathan Swift might have thought that the development of lapsed-time photography has proven a useful pedagogical device for forcing observers to recognize an almost animal-like form of movement in the life-cycles of vegetables, weeds, and British institutions. He might have said that London's old Empire, exhausted from her labors, is turning to a new, less toilsome existence as a quaint theme-park in a U.N.O.-administered, global, multicultural zoo.

Such might be the construction put upon the growing stream of Britons recently evacuating the Church of England.

The London *Observer*, on the occasion of the Duchess of Kent's announced conversion to Catholicism, quoted historian Paul Johnson: "The long-expected collapse of the Anglican Church is now beginning and its days are numbered. The Anglican Church has so many internal contradictions that it is beginning to make its life impossible and ordinary people are recoiling from it."

I believe that that collapse of the Anglican Church as an institution, is a reflection of the former British Empire's virtually completed metempsychosis, its reincarnation as that imperial U.N.O. squatting in dramatic irony upon slaughter-house ground near New York's East River. I am not prepared yet to fix the precise date on which that metamorphosis occurred, but it is an arguable proposition today, that we have passed over from the time that the U.N.O. Security Council was used by evil forces within nations, to a time, as in the former Yugoslavia, when even major nation-state powers are used as virtual mere satraps by a U.N.O. empire.

The possibly temporary capitulation of the U.S. government to the new authority of the U.N.O., as in the U.N.O.'s protection for Serbia's continuing crimes against humanity in the Balkans, suggests that the turning-point has been reached, that no nation-state, no matter how powerful, is disposed to resist even whimsical, arbitrary, irrational caprices even against entire peoples by the U.N.O.

The transition to the U.N.O.

The transition occurred at some time during the 1982-91 interval, under the long parliamentary regime of Britain's Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. The obvious benchmarks for defining the transition are the similarly artficed Thatcher

wars against Argentina in 1982, and Iraq in 1990-91.

The Thatcher regime's method of operation was the same in both cases.

In 1982, Thatcher's regime, through her foreign minister, Kissinger patron Lord Peter Carrington, pulled a typically British 18th-century cabinet-warfare stunt at the bargaining table, provoking the government of the Republic of Argentina in the extreme. Meanwhile, through Carrington and Kissinger's assets inside the U.S. government, Buenos Aires was officially misled to believe it had the full sympathy and backing of the United States.

In 1990, the war against Iraq was set up by Thatcher's regime in the same manner. Britain's Kuwait puppet was encouraged to provoke Baghdad outrageously. Again, U.S. channels willfully misled Baghdad to believe it had official U.S. encouragement to use a free hand in dealing with Kuwait's provocations. The difference was, that this time, Thatcher and her Trilby Bush set the war up as a highly profitable business operation for London and New York, running the war under the flag of the U.N.O.

Following the Iraq war's shooting phase, London continued the pattern in the Middle East by using the U.N.O. to cover for London's long-standing Serbian assets under the fascist leadership of Slobodan Milosevic. When the administration of President Clinton threatened to challenge this British-created atrocity in the Balkans, it was on the authority of, and by the U.N.O., that the Serbian aggressors were encouraged to accelerate their atrocities.

This was not a London submission to the U.N.O. It was London which had created the U.N.O., had controlled the key U.N.O. institutions through various channels, such as those associated with relevant British nationals such as Brigadier John Rawlings Rees and Julian Huxley, or through British Commonwealth creatures who were fully certified Judas Goats from the British colonial training farms. The U.N.O. is nothing but a creation of the same Venetian financiers, formerly associated with Lord Shelburne's British East India Company, the Liberal imperialists who transformed the British Isles from a group of nations into its former power as a neo-Roman, global empire "on which the sun never sets."

For this Iraq-Balkans ceremony, which transferred the

spirit of the old empire from the rotting husk of London's former glory, to the banks of New York's East River, Margaret Thatcher, the official British Nanny of the moment, performed the unwholesome duties of official witch.

In a lapsed-time overview of the nearly 500 Venetian years since Anne Boleyn's seduction of King Henry VIII, the eggs which Venice laid in London hatched, and the eggs of London's transplanted Venetians are now hatching in their turn, this time on the west bank of what is known euphemistically as the East River.

The Third Rome and its religion

This sets in context the matter of the Church of England. In A.D. 1510 the monk Filofeo of Pskov prophesied that Muscovy shall become the capital of a Third Roman Empire, which shall have no successor. In London, the relevant circles are confident that Moscow has lost that race, that the Third Rome now flies the blue-blooded flag of the U.N.O. To Brits of that sexual or whatever persuasion, the old Church of England has become a superannuated irrelevance, perhaps even an outright nuisance.

The British Liberal aristocracy usually contrived to treat as two quite distinct matters, their public policy toward the Established Church and their not necessarily related private religious views. To accuse patrons of 18th-century British Hell-Fire Clubs of diffidence toward God would be carrying understatement much too far; it would be fair to say of most of those Liberals and their Fabian litters, that they were permeated with the same specific quality of Ashmolean indifference toward truth shown by Harvard University's William James in his *The Varieties of Religious Experience*.

Religion was, and remains for them a practical matter of imperial administrative policy, as it was for the Pontifex Maximus of pagan Rome's pantheon. Someone has perhaps said already, and that most aptly, that whenever Satan moves into a neighborhood, the first thing he does is to integrate himself by joining the local church, whatever that may be. As long as post-15th-century Europe remained the political center of the world, as it has until the most recent phase of the post-1963 "cultural paradigm shift," the position of the British monarch as Pontifex Maximus of what was at least outwardly a Christian church was an indispensable part of the functions of British imperial power.

As the center of imperial power shifts to a predominantly non-Christian U.N.O., as it was in the time of the Caesars, Christianity is now the leading counterforce against the often outrageously satanic, multicultural practices of a pagan imperium.

Thus, as this shift of the center of "Atlanticist" power abandons the husks of Britain's past, to become the pagan U.N.O., the Anglican Church and the monarchy, like most of the British population, are fast becoming unwanted anachronisms, having been used for a while, now perhaps to be thrown away.

The Bosnian Hector must win this time

by Katharine Kanter

As a child, I was shaken to the core by Homer's account of the Trojan hero Hector, who, guiltless, unlike his brother Paris, of any crime against the Greeks, nonetheless decided to embody the state, fought and died for others' sake. Hector was the only figure in the *Iliad* moved by love and pity for those who, unless he acted, must die—I revolted against his death and the unjust manner of it.

Now the latest Bosnian Ilios, Gorazde in eastern Bosnia, is about to fall to a massive Serbian offensive which began on March 29. There are about 65,000 people in the city, and about 76,000 in the enclave; over 2,000 people have fled into the city, as the Serbians took and plundered one after the other of the surrounding villages.

It was the the last week in March, under the cheerful eye of the U.N. voyeurs ("observers"), that the Serbians began to move tanks, armored vehicles, heavy trucks, and other war matériel, from their stronghold in Pale above Sarajevo, along the road to Gorazde. In the night of March 30 alone, over a thousand regular troops of the Yugoslavian National Army crossed over the border from Serbia into Bosnia to join the offensive. There have been days when *one shell per second* fell upon the city, where 100 have died; and several hundred have been wounded in the last days alone. Most of the wounded cannot be got to the hospital, as there is no means to transport them.

If the Serbians get into the city, they will kill all the men, rape the women, and the Red Cross will stand around and tear out their hair and shriek, as they did when Vukovar fell in Croatia. Thanks to the Serbians' ever-loving ally Unprofor, which has quietly been pulling out of the area around Srebrenica and Zepa, those towns, as well as Bugojno and Kladanj, have all been under long-range artillery fire since the end of March. Clearly, the Serbians aim to take the whole of eastern Bosnia, and if you were wondering whether the United States is going to let this happen, the answer so far, is *yes*.

Following U.S. Defense Secretary William Perry's luminous lead on April 3 ("We're not looking at extensions of the use of that air power today, but you could conceive of another situation like Sarajevo arising where we might consider it"), Gen. John Shalikashvili, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, said on April 5: "Right now our judgment is that conditions in Gorazde do not lend themselves to the use of air power. It is our judgment that heavy weapons are not the