

Britain's Blair Launches 'New Empire' Offensive

by Mark Burdman

British Prime Minister Tony Blair's 10 Downing Street Cabinet Office and the British Foreign Office have launched an unabashed public campaign, for Great Britain to be at the helm of a re-shaped Anglo-American world empire. The British monarchy's Prime Minister and his entourage are shamelessly exploiting the terror atrocities of Sept. 11 in New York and Washington, to reintroduce the worst features of the heyday of the Victorian-era British Empire. As stated by the architects of the policy, the aim, is to eliminate the institution of the sovereign nation-state, and to return humanity to the bestial feudal state of affairs that prevailed before the 15th-Century Renaissance.

The immediate focal point of the neo-imperial offensive, is to further crush, and then occupy as colonies, nations—such as Afghanistan—that the Blairites and their American collaborators declare to be “failed states.” In all cases, as for Afghanistan, these so-called “failed states” have been driven into desperation by wars fostered primarily by the Anglo-American and Israeli intelligence services, and by the austerity “conditionalities” policies of the International Monetary Fund (IMF).

The chief public advocate for this neo-imperial campaign is senior British diplomat Robert Cooper, Blair's chief foreign policy guru, at the Cabinet Office. In mid-October, Cooper was seconded to the Foreign Office, on a special mission. This was revealed by Foreign Secretary Jack Straw, in an Oct. 22 speech entitled “Order Out Of Chaos: The Future Of Afghanistan,” to the International Institute of Strategic Studies in London. Straw announced that “we have now appointed a senior Foreign Office official, Robert Cooper, . . . to develop our thinking, and to work, with the United States, and other international partners, on a consensus.” Straw praised Cooper as an “author and thinker on post-modern states.”

Prior to this announcement, Cooper had authored a “signal” policy piece, for the October edition of the British establishment magazine *Prospect*, entitled “The Next Empire,” in which he argued for imposing what is announced in the headline. According to British sources, the piece was written before the atrocities of Sept. 11 and published soon thereafter. Several observers wonder if this sequence of events lends credibility to suspicions that there was a substantial British hand in what happened on Sept. 11, and that plans were already in motion to exploit events such as those that occurred on that date, to create the conditions for realizing this strategy.

'Blairzymandias'

Cooper and his imperial propaganda have received extensive hype in the British press. On Oct. 10, the London *Financial Times'* leading “free trade” propagandist, Martin Wolf, wrote a piece entitled “The Need For A New Imperialism,” in which he hailed Blair's desire to “reorder the world,” centered around “a transformation in our approach to national sovereignty.” Wolf favorably cited a 1996 piece by Cooper, re-issued in 2000, entitled “The Postmodern State And The World Order,” written for two preeminent Blair-era think-tanks, Demos and the Foreign Policy Centre. In it, Cooper had called for a “defensive imperialism” against “pre-modern states.”

On Oct. 25, the London *Daily Telegraph*, owned by arch-imperialist Hollinger Corp. chief executive Conrad Black, published an article entitled “Whitehall Prophet Of The New Imperialism.” It revealed that Blair has been reading Rudyard Kipling, and is telling people that he, Blair, is working on a modern version of Kipling's “white man's burden,” the which would be an attempt by “the West” to “create a new kind of empire.” The *Telegraph* affirmed that “there is much thinking going on in Downing Street and the Foreign Office about how ‘empire’ should be re-invented,” and that the “key adviser” on this is Cooper.

The Oct. 28 London *Sunday Times* reprinted a chunk of Cooper's *Prospect* article, under the title, “Dawn Chorus For The New Age Of Empire.”

On Oct. 31, the London *Guardian* published a commentary by Oxford University Professor of History Niall Ferguson, entitled “Welcome The New Imperialism.” While not specifically referring to Cooper's writings, Ferguson was on the same wavelength, saying that what is needed now is “international colonial rule,” and calling upon the United States to step forward as a “formal empire,” a “self-confident imperial power” that could operate as the “global hegemon.”

This campaign is being greeted with a “thumbs down” by numbers of British strategists opposed to Blair, as *EIR* has learned from recent discussions. Their voice was expressed by a cartoon by Steve Bell in the *Guardian*, right next to the Ferguson piece. It depicted a giant statue of Blair's face, in the desert, sinking into the sand, with the caption, “Blairzymandias.” This is a play on the famous poem “Ozymandias,” by Percy Bysshe Shelley, on how the grand imperial designs of an Egyptian Pharaoh, to whom Shelley gave the name Ozymandias, crumbled into dust. That poem has been cited by Lyndon LaRouche, as a metaphor, for the fate awaiting today's would-be imperial masters of the planet.

Reversing The Renaissance

Early on in his “The Next Empire” article, Cooper wrote: “Empire is indeed history. Almost all that we know of history, from Sumeria through Babylon, Egypt, the Assyrian empire, through Persia, Greece, Rome, Byzantium, through the Chinese dynasties, the Carolingian empire, the Holy Roman Em-

pire, the Mongol empire, the Habsburg empire, the Spanish, Portuguese, British, French, Dutch, and German empires to the Soviet empire, plus many that we have forgotten, all of this suggests that the history of the world is the history of empire.”

Soon thereafter, he got to the crux of the matter, that what he is proposing, is an attack on the nation-state institution that grew out of the 15th Century’s Italy-centered Golden Renaissance. As LaRouche has stressed, the nation-state was created, as uniquely capable of realizing the general welfare for the entire population, and of transcending the era when masses of humans were treated as cattle. Cooper and his ilk prefer a return to the system of imperial Rome and pre-Renaissance feudalism.

Cooper wrote: “Compared with empire, the nation-state is a new concept; the small state began to emerge with the Renaissance and the nation became a major political factor only in the 19th Century. For most of the period since, the nation-state has been confined to a limited part of the globe. Not by accident, this has also been the most dynamic part. The non-existence of empire, however, is historically without precedent. The question is whether this can last. There are both theoretical and practical reasons for thinking that it won’t. . . .

“The practical problem with a world of nation-states is that many of the post-colonial states have weak national identities, weak political institutions, and weak economies. Some of these—especially in Africa—are near collapse. Others, in Central Asia, Southeast Asia, or the South Pacific do not look healthy. In many cases one would have to say that self-government and self-determination have failed. . . .

“The weak states of the post-imperial world are disastrous for those who live in them and are bad for the rest of us. . . . The risks for neighbors are especially important. The domino theory was false for communism, but it may be true for chaos. . . .

“All the conditions seem to be there for a new imperialism. There are countries which need an outside force to create stability (recently in Sierra Leone a rally called for the return of British rule). . . . And though there are fewer missionaries today, there is a new class of imperial auxiliaries in the form of NGOs [non-governmental organizations] trying to help people who need it and preaching human rights—the secular religion of today’s world . . . a system in which the strong protect the weak, in which the efficient and well governed export stability and liberty, in which the world is open for investment and growth—all of these seem eminently desirable. If empire has not often been like that, it has frequently been better than the chaos and barbarism that it replaced.”

IMF, Globalization: The New Forms Of Empire

Such verbiage is self-serving, hypocritical sophistry. Typical of the doctor whose cure is designed to kill the patient, Cooper praised the IMF and globalization, as exemplary of

the “imperialist” policies he is recommending! This polemic has the perverse usefulness of confirming *EIR*’s warning, that IMF policies and globalization are just re-treaded forms of imperialism. But the “weak economies, chaos and barbarism” in the “weak states,” are a direct consequence of the imposition of policies typified by the IMF and “globalization.”

Cooper lauded the policies of the IMF and its “interference in domestic affairs,” as fostering “good governance” and creating the conditions for foreign investments. He commented: “How different is this from what Lord Cromer and others did in Egypt?” This is a reference to the Anglo-French control of Egyptian finances, beginning in 1875, the which, Cooper wrote, “sounds remarkably like a rather strict IMF program.” This IMF-focussed system, Cooper asserted, is the core of what he calls “the imperialism of globalization.”

(In his article, Oxford’s Ferguson wrote that “Globalization is a fancy word for imperialism. . . . However you dress it up, whatever rhetoric you may use, it is not very different in practice to what Great Britain did in the 19th Century.”)

Cooper concluded by recommending that the European Union evolve into a new structure called “cooperative empire,” an alternative name for which could be “Commonwealth”—as in the Queen’s British Commonwealth. He wrote, “Like Rome, this Europe would provide its citizens with some laws, some coins, and the occasional road.” This would be “a noble dream”—or, better said, the dream of a degraded lackey of nobility.

Cooper has had a heavy travel itinerary, in an attempt to implement his proposed policy. After Straw announced Cooper’s new coordinating role on Oct. 22, Cooper headed off to the crisis zone, making his first stops in Iran and Pakistan. Supposedly, he is trying to concoct a scheme for a UN protectorate for a “post-Taliban Afghanistan.”

During the week of Oct. 22, Blair met Prince Charles, to discuss the Royal Heir’s role in mobilizing Muslim support for the war in Afghanistan.

Beginning the week of Oct. 22, a virtual brigade of British government officials has been in Washington, including Straw, Defense Minister Geoff Hoon, and Blair’s chief “spin doctor,” Alastair Campbell, recently upgraded to be 10 Downing Street director of strategy and communications. Blair himself is on the latest of several post-Sept. 11 international tours, taking him, this time, to Syria, Israel, Palestine, and Saudi Arabia.

Blair’s freneticism has earned him some new nicknames, from those not pleased by his arrogant profiling. Maverick British writer John Laughland, in the Oct. 27 *Spectator* magazine, dubbed Blair “the Groupie of the New World Order.” Meanwhile, the more frenetic he gets, the more the support, in Britain, for the war in Afghanistan and related adventures, wanes, according to polls released on Oct. 30. And, the more vocal the opposition to Blair becomes, typified by a piece in the Oct. 29 *Daily Mirror* entitled, “This War Is A Fraud.”

Blairzymandias, anyone?