

# Blair's Redcoat invasion flops

by Scott Thompson and Mark Burdman

In a typical display of British treachery and arrogance, British Prime Minister Tony Blair went behind the back of his so-called "friend," President Bill Clinton, to barnstorm America and Congress on behalf of what Blair purports to be a new "Doctrine for the International Community." In reality, it is an ambitious plan for an Anglo-American global imperium, under a NATO flag.

Fortunately, Blair's efforts were harshly rebuffed by President Clinton, and, as a result of Blair's ham-handed efforts, the rift between the United States and Britain is wider now than at any point since Blair was installed at 10 Downing Street by the British establishment.

Arriving in Washington on April 21, two days before other participants for the NATO at the 50th Anniversary Summit, the British delegation, led by Blair, Foreign Secretary Robin Cook, and Defense Secretary George Robertson, fanned out to sell their new "doctrine," which calls for globalization of NATO, and the use of any and all means, to bail out the bankrupt London-Wall Street global financial bubble.

This British invasion, which included a media talk show blitz, a Blair speech to the Chicago Economic Club, and private meetings with the leaders of the U.S. Congress, aimed to build a groundswell of American public opinion against President Clinton's refusal to accept British plans for an expansion of the war against Yugoslavia to include hundreds of thousands of ground troops. Fortunately, this propaganda effort proved to be a pathetic failure, as most Americans recoiled at the prospect of a British Prime Minister asserting that the British-American-Commonwealth (BAC) bloc would set military policy, sacrificing American lives for their schemes.

## Wooing Congress

On April 22, Blair set off to sell his ground war and naval blockade to Congress, by "chatting up" Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-Miss.) and Minority Leader Tom Daschle (D-S.D.) in a "doorstep" meeting at the U.S. Capitol. The next day, Her Majesty's "three stooges"—Blair, Cook, and Robertson—met with broader layers of Congress, in what was billed as a "Congressional Commemorative Event" in the Capitol Rotunda.

Despite British efforts to bypass Clinton, Lott announced on April 26 that he would oppose debate on a "divisive resolu-

tion" offered by seven Congressmen including Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), a GOP Presidential hopeful. McCain said that the United States must do everything possible to win the war against Yugoslavia, including sending tens of thousands of U.S. troops as part of a British-planned and NATO-led invasion. McCain and Sen. John Kyl (R-Ariz.) were active participants in the so-called "Phoenix Congress" of the New Atlantic Initiative, a BAC front-group headed by Lady Margaret Thatcher.

## A new imperial system

On April 22, Blair became the first British Prime Minister to visit Chicago, where he gave his megalomaniac "Doctrine for the International Community" speech to the Economic Club. According to the British Foreign and Commonwealth Office, the speech, which was immediately disseminated worldwide, was "dedicated to the cause of internationalism against isolationism."

In his speech, Blair located the need for "globalizing NATO" in far-flung operations against distasteful "dictators," in the context of the globalization of the marketplace, and as part of the new, post-Cold War "Information Age." Blair asserted that, because members of the UN Security Council had opposed the war against Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic, it may be necessary to overhaul how the UN functions, so that there will be no interference with NATO's interventions in military conflicts wherever the British desire.

Blair's Chicago speech makes absolutely clear that, from the British standpoint, the war in Kosovo is the "entry-point" for a new global imperial system.

Blair began by hypocritically raving about the "atrocities" in Kosovo, insisting that "there is no alternative to continuing until we succeed." There will be no negotiation on the war aims, he said; "Milosevic must accept them," i.e., unconditional surrender. Blair claimed that "this is a just war"—despite British instigation of many of the "atrocities"—and boasted that "the Kosovo Liberation Army is now larger and has more support than when Milosevic started his campaign."

Blair spoke about the "wider context" of the war in Kosovo. Under the title, "Global Interdependence," he was as bellicose in speaking of economics as he was of Milosevic and Yugoslavia: "We are all internationalists now, whether we like it or not. We cannot refuse to participate in global markets if we want to prosper," he said. "On the eve of a new millennium we are now in a new world. We need new rules for international cooperation and new ways of organizing our international institutions."

Blair said, "We need to focus in a serious and sustained way on the principles of the doctrine of international community and on the institutions that deliver them." This would include, he said, "a thorough, far-reaching overhaul and reform of the system of international financial regulation," which, he added, ought to begin at the G-7 summit in Cologne



*British Prime Minister Tony Blair addresses the opening session of the NATO summit. By the time the summit began, Blair was already on the defensive and at odds with most of the other heads of state.*

in June; “a new push on free trade in the World Trade Organization with the new round beginning in Seattle this autumn”; “a reconsideration of the role, workings, and decision-making process of the United Nations, and in particular the UN Security Council”; and, more efforts to “slow down and stop global warming.”

Under the heading of “Globalization,” he babbled: “We live in a completely new world. Every day, about \$1 trillion moves across the foreign exchanges, most of it in London. . . . Any government that thinks it can go it alone is wrong. If the markets don’t like your policies they will punish you. The same is true of trade. Protectionism is the surest way to poverty.”

Under the heading “International Security,” he hit the point he was aiming at all along: “Globalization has transformed economies and our working places. But globalization is not just economic, it is also a political and security phenomenon. . . .

“The principles of international community apply also to international security. We now have a decade of experience since the end of the Cold War. . . . Our armed forces have been busier than ever . . . occasionally engaging in major wars as we did in the Gulf in 1991 and are currently doing in the Balkans. . . .

“Many of our problems have been caused by two dangerous and ruthless men — Saddam Hussein and Slobodan Milosevic. . . . As a result of these destructive policies both have brought calamity on their own peoples. . . .

“If NATO fails in Kosovo, the next dictator to be threatened with military force may well not believe our resolve to carry the threat through. . . .

“The most pressing foreign policy problem we face is to identify the circumstances in which we should get actively involved in other people’s conflicts.”

He identified several “considerations” that would justify such interference, and called for a change in “the UN and its Security Council,” in reaction to Russian and Chinese opposition to NATO’s war. For Blair and the British oligarchy, Russia and China are the targets of their “new Cold War,” and therefore, NATO must have the freedom to act without Security Council approval.

Blair and company’s arrogance generated a great deal of fury among many American citizens, who saw through the British game. On April 27, the London *Financial Times* published a letter to the editor by Neal Ball of Chicago, who wrote: “As Americans we are greatly indebted to Tony Blair for his leadership of our war effort. At a time when our own leaders express caution—perhaps overly concerned about human lives and the political consequences of calling up reserves and authorizing additional billions of defense dollars from taxes—Mr. Blair came to urge us to screw up our courage to the sticking point and not to go wobbly by ending hostilities. As the battle becomes bloodier, we feel assured that Mr. Blair will stoop to negotiation only in the most urgent instance, and that when he does offer a kingdom for a horse, our nation will be a prominent part of that settlement.”