

The Neo-Cons Are British Liberal Imperialists

by Mary Burdman

British Prime Minister Tony Blair proclaimed the end of the sovereign nation-state, in his speech to the United Nations General Assembly on Sept. 12. In his short address, Blair demonstrated why Lyndon LaRouche is so emphatic that now is the time to end the pernicious influence of the British “Liberal Imperialists” on the United States. Vice President Dick Cheney and his cohorts are now under huge pressure in Washington, but to defeat the neo-conservatives, their policies have to be dug out at the root. And the roots are the policies of the 19th-Century Liberal Imperialists, who used free trade, “gunboat diplomacy,” and national liberation fronts to get global reach—and to set the stage for the world wars of the 20th Century.

Indeed, the “neo-cons” who now dominate the Cheney-George W. Bush Administration, claim Blair as one of their own, in the Liberal Imperial tradition of Lord Palmerston and Winston Churchill. Blair’s “New Labour” regime is a prime example of how imperial politics really work, exposing the foolish notion that conflicts between “left” and “right” mean something. To understand the extent of the threat posed by Cheney, Bush, and Blair, it is essential that people, especially those *outside* the United States, finally realize that “neo-cons” are not “right-wing Americans,” but an alien and far nastier species.

In his short address to the UN World Summit, Blair demanded that the United Nations “must become the visible and credible expression of the globalization of politics.” Humanity supports “common values” of what he calls freedom, tolerance, human rights, and opposition to extremism, Blair proclaimed: “For the first time at this Summit we are agreed that states do not have the right to do what they will within their own borders, but that we, in the name of humanity, have a common duty to protect people where their own governments

will not.” Blair thus threw out the fundamental principle of national sovereignty, on which the UN was founded, and attempted to *justify* invasion—whether by military, political, or economic means—of any nation whose policies do not cohere with those of Tony Blair.

This Blair obsession of using “values” to destroy national sovereignty is “appallingly dangerous,” a leading British military historian told *EIR* Oct. 17. Blair is “trying to overturn the Treaty of Westphalia of 1648, the treaty which protects sovereign nations from invasion,” based on ideologies, “religious,” or other conflicts. If you rip up the Treaty of Westphalia for your own ends, what should prevent some Islamic or other extremist from attacking a Western nation because of what they call its decadence?

Blair’s fixation on “values” actually justifies ever-greater aggression, as author Ben Rawlence, formerly foreign policy advisor to the Liberal Democratic Party, wrote in *The Guardian* in October 2004. Blair’s “distinction between values and interests is crucial,” Rawlence wrote. “Interests are usually defended, values are promoted. Interests are material and can be defined, values are hard to pin down and know no limit. . . . The problem occurs when British security is linked to the spread of those values, and when we wage war in their name. British national interest is explicitly located in the internal affairs of other countries, violating international traditions of non-interference, and destabilizing governments.”

Against the Treaty of Westphalia

Blair had attacked the Treaty directly in a speech of March 5, 2004, written by the radical new-wave imperialist Robert Cooper (who has since moved on to the European Union in Brussels). Embroiled in growing controversy over the failure to find any weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, Blair revealed

why he had really gone to war, and asserted that he had wanted to break from the Westphalia principle *before* the Sept. 11, 2001 attacks. While Sept. 11 changed “the world’s view of the justification of military action,” Blair said, “humanitarian grounds” were already becoming a justification for war. “I was already reaching for a different philosophy in international relations from a traditional one that has held sway since the treaty of Westphalia in 1648; namely, that a country’s internal affairs are for it and you don’t interfere unless it threatens you, or breaches a treaty, or triggers an obligation of alliance.”

This “philosophy,” Blair claimed, justified the assault on Iraq—whatever the results. The “best defense of our security lies in the spread of our values,” Blair claimed. “But we cannot advance these values except within a framework that recognizes their universality. If it is a global threat, it needs a global response, based on global rules. . . . If we are threatened, we have a right to act. . . . We surely have a duty and a right to prevent the threat materializing; and we surely have a respon-



www.britainusa.com

*Says Lyndon LaRouche:
“Blair is a Limp
. . . a real war-
monger.”*

LaRouche: Blair the Fascist

In his Oct. 12 international webcast, Lyndon LaRouche elaborated on Tony Blair’s pedigree, in response to a question on Angela Merkel and the neo-cons in Europe.

. . . The fascist in Britain, is Tony Blair and the Blair government, the Labour government. Now, this is consistent with Britain. If you want a fascist in Britain, you don’t go to the Conservative Party, you go to the Labour Party. That’s where most of the fascists in Britain have come from. [T]he fascists in Britain of the 1930s, were from the Labour Party background, from the Fabian Society. The Fabian Society was the imperialist arm of imperialist policy of the Prince of Wales, Bertie, later Edward VII, who organized World War I almost all by himself. A purely evil character. So, the Fabian Society produced what we call the “Liberal Imperialists,” otherwise called “Limps.” . . .

Now, by pedigree, Blair is a Limp. I haven’t talked to his wife about this, but he’s a Limp. And he is the fellow that is the real war-monger. He is directly connected to Cheney, through members of what was his government, through Lynne Cheney, Cheney’s wife. And, she is the one who is the controller in the family. . . .

[T]he Bush-Cheney-Blair connection is the essence of the neo-cons. The neo-cons’ significance is that they are Trotskyists. Permanent Revolution. And these are the variety of Trotskyists, who are told, by their banker owners:

“Look, we are letting you in on the inside of this thing. We were leftists, you know, but that’s only one aspect of us. You are now prepared to go to a higher level of confidence and be an insider. You now can become a real Trotskyist, who understands the secret codeword meaning of ‘Permanent Revolution’: which is permanent warfare, and permanent regime-change.”

So, then they’re told that they’re now advisors, think-tank advisors, of Permanent Revolution, permanent war. What you are dealing with is a special kind of anti-capitalist mentality. Now, they understand by capitalism, not finance. “Finance is good. Capital is bad. Industry is bad. Industrialism is bad. Finance is good. Stealing is good. Money ruling the world is good. We work for bankers: They support us. They fund us.” So, that’s what the neo-con is.

But, the reality is not the neo-con. The reality is what uses it. The reality is the *bankers*, who use it. And, I mentioned already, our dear friend Felix Rohatyn from New York, who is famous for Big MAC—not the edible variety, but the inedible variety; the one who takes your food away from you. And, this is where the danger comes from. It always is this. This kind of scum. This fascist scum. And they are fascist scum! In the strict sense. This fascist scum comes from a certain section of bankers, which are called the Synarchist International. And, it is the *bankers* who use them. It is the bankers they serve. It’s the bankers that fund them. It’s the bankers that move them into positions that they are in. Look at who owns them. The *Washington Post* is one of the centers of this stuff, part of the scumbag operation. That’s how it works. . . .

sibility to act when a nation's people are subjected to a regime such as Saddam's."

The result of Blair's assertion of his "values" in Iraq is clear: ever-worsening war, chaos, and an existential threat to the nation itself. But Blair is clearly not satisfied. Recently, he had the effrontery to warn Iran off from "interfering" in Iraq!

The very deep opposition in Britain, to any operation against Iran is restraining Blair—clearly, against his will. On Oct. 6, Blair proclaimed that explosive devices being used by insurgents in Iraq were like those used by the Hezbollah, which he linked to Iran. "There is no justification for Iran or any other country interfering in Iraq," Blair said. He is obviously incapable of listening to himself.

'Neo-Con Thought' Is British

Irwin Stelzer, Hudson Institute Senior Fellow and a former director of the American Enterprise Institute, proudly emphasized the long British imperial pedigree of neo-con

doctrine, in his introduction to his 2004 book *The Neocon Reader*, which attempts to make "Neo-Con Thought" coherent. The book is in reality little more than a diatribe against LaRouche's growing political influence in the United States. But on one matter, Stelzer is right: As he wrote in his Introduction, the "doctrine of pre-emption, the perceived need to deal with 'rogue states,' and some other ingredients of Neo-conservatism . . . were espoused by British leaders, including [George] Canning, [Lord] Palmerston, [Winston] Churchill, and [Margaret] Thatcher, long before they were adopted by George W. Bush. . . .

"So, too with domestic policy," Stelzer wrote. "Compassionate conservatism" did not originate with Bush's advisors. "Instead, these ideas originated with Victorian reformers."

Blair's key qualification for being a stalwart of the neo-con operations, is his fixation on "moral purpose"—in addition to his love of bombing people, Stelzer said. "Tony Blair's assertion of the universality of Western ideals, and his will-

Palmerston, Canning, And Tony Blair

Tony Blair, who so loves to babble about "progressive" change and his government's great reforms, is unquestionably the heir to the British imperial hawks, led by Lord Palmerston. Blair's New Labour government has taken the United Kingdom to war more often than any other leadership since World War II.

In December 1998, in a speech on foreign affairs, Blair proclaimed: "My vision for New Labour is to become, as the Liberal Party was in the 19th Century, a broad coalition of those who believe in progress and justice, not a narrow class-based politics, but a Party founded on clear values, whose means of implementation change with the generations."

The Liberal Party was set up by Britain's biggest imperialist, Henry Temple, third Viscount Palmerston, and Lord John Russell, beginning in 1835. Their policies were the model for New Labour—free trade, economic imperialism (globalization), and worldwide military adventures. Britain now has much less power than was wielded by Palmerston, but Blair's policy is to make Britain "pivotal"—trying always to tip the balance, especially between the United States and Europe.

From 1829-65, Palmerston led British imperial machinations against almost every other nation. Although his "forward school" policies were opposed by many in the British establishment, for 35 years, he dominated British imperial policy. In Europe, he deployed "national libera-

tion movements" and wars against the Austrian Empire, Russia, and Prussia. (See "Lord Palmerston's Imperial Zoo," *EIR*, April 15, 1994.) Palmerston presided over crushing the Great Mutiny in India, and orchestrated the Opium Wars against China. He was also an absentee landlord with one of the worst reputations for brutality during the Irish famine. Beyond all this, Palmerston was the enemy of the United States. His government supported the Confederacy in its effort to break away from the United States—but here was defeated by the cooperation of Abraham Lincoln and Tsar Alexander II of Russia.

Gunboat Diplomacy

Palmerston's great weapon was the British Royal Navy. His operations were the first to be dubbed "gunboat diplomacy." This naval power was used to enforce Palmerston's policy of worldwide "extraterritoriality" for Britons: In 1850, Palmerston proclaimed the rule of "*Civis Romanus sum*, every Briton is a citizen of this new Rome."

George Canning, Palmerston's predecessor as Foreign Minister, had focussed his imperial designs especially on South America. He deployed the Royal Navy to the region, in direct combat with John Quincy Adams's Monroe Doctrine, which banned European imperial interference in the Americas, based on the principle of a "community of sovereign nations." Canning said he wanted to make South America "free [from Spain] and English." Canning abhorred what he called the "evils of democracy," but wanted Liberal reforms in Britain and elsewhere, to preserve monarchy, property, and order, from the principles of the American Revolution. Canning saw Britain's prosperity coming from commercial expansion all over the world, including huge investments into South America.

ingness to deploy forces in defense of those ideals, in the face of enormous opposition [in Britain] . . . signal that Britain will stand by America. The same is true of Australia. Perhaps Winston Churchill and Margaret Thatcher were right when they said that it was up to the English-speaking peoples to provide the nucleus of the support for a sensible world order.”

Here again, George Bush’s constant reiteration of how he wants to strike “terr’ists,” falls far behind the most radical “Neo-Con Thought.” In a tour of China, India, and other nations just before the UN Summit, Blair stridently attacked “extremism” as the universal enemy—taking the whole neo-con-launched world conflict beyond war against terrorist strikes, to a wild attempt at universal thought control.

Blair was not the first to spout “values” as the foundation for imperial expansion. In the late 1830s, Arthur Connolly, the British intelligence officer deployed into Central Asia (who first coined the phrase the “Great Game”), proposed the broad expansion of British imperial forces into Eurasia as “a band of Christian heroes entering the remote regions of Central Asia as Champions of Humanity and Pioneers of Civilization,” as reported by the historian Sir John Kay. In attempting to resolve all the problems of Central Asia by playing the “Grand Game” there, Connolly wrote, “we shall play the noble part that the first Christian nation of the world ought to fill.”

Stelzer features Tony Blair among his “Neo-Con Thought” authors and republished Blair’s 1999 speech on the “Doctrine of the International Community,” also a product of new imperialist Cooper. This was Blair’s first big effort to bring the United States into a war he was sponsoring, at that time in the Balkans. The whole neo-con operation is a break from “traditional” conservatism and Cold War “containment,” Stelzer wrote: Neo-cons’ policies of pre-emption and nation-building put them “in the direction of a form of imperialism.” Stelzer also embraced Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, two of the worst British imperial “moles” in U.S. Presidential history.

In addition to Stelzer, neo-con stalwarts William Kristol and Richard Perle have embraced Tony Blair as “one of their own.” In October 2004, both the American Enterprise Institute’s “prince of darkness” Richard Perle, and *Weekly Standard* publisher William Kristol, professed their affinity with Blair on BBC One’s “Panorama” program. Perle said: “Blair’s moral sense is, very much reflected in the thinking of many neo-conservatives. I suppose he’d be horrified to hear that, especially since the term neo-conservative is so abused. But his sense that it was right to liberate Iraq, is the sense of neo-conservatives and was not the view of most foreign offices, including probably his own.”

Kristol told “Panorama”: “Tony Blair does have a fundamental understanding of this. That for justice and liberty to prevail in the world, force sometimes has to be used. It’s very nice to sit around and say, ‘We’re in Europe, and we believe in the rule of law, we believe in the United Nations.’ But Saddam Hussein is there, and he’s a dictator and he has weapons of mass destruction [sic].

“And are you going to do something about it or not? And in so far as Tony Blair’s answer was yes, even if the rest of the UN Security Council doesn’t agree with us, I think Tony Blair is a kind of neo-conservative, despite himself.”

The Empire’s Pre-emptive Strikes

In Stelzer’s book, Tory Member of Parliament and London *Times* resident neo-con Michael Gove asserts total British imperial responsibility for “Neo-Con Thought.” In his article on the “Very British Roots of Neo-conservatism,” Gove wrote: “If Canning, Palmerston, or Churchill were alive today they would recognize their policies being carried on by Paul Wolfowitz, Donald Rumsfeld, and George Bush. Perhaps more importantly, they would see that the principles by which they had guided Britain, were now being enacted by the U.S.”

Gove asserts that “America’s neo-conservatives did not invent pre-emption. Nor reliance on intelligence services. Nor the use of ‘self-preservation’ and the need to ‘rescue the world’ from tyranny as justification for pre-emptive strikes.” This was all done by the British Empire in centuries past.

Gove first cites British Foreign Secretary George Canning’s “audacious pre-emptive strike” against the Danish fleet in August 1807, which prevented the Scandinavian countries from joining Napoleon’s naval blockade against Britain. Canning’s protégé, Viscount Palmerston, proclaimed to the Parliament that it was “to the law of self-preservation that England appeals as a justification for her proceedings.” Almost 150 years later, in July 1940, Winston Churchill ordered a British Navy attack on the Vichy French fleet in port at Mers e-Kebir in Algeria, which destroyed most French naval power. This action showed that Britain was going to continue to fight Nazi Germany, Gove said.

The 2003 pre-emptive strike on Iraq was not a “break with the past,” or any new approach, Gove wrote. The Iraq war “follows a traditional pattern set by British statesmen of the past. Insofar as neo-conservatism is a philosophy for foreign policy, it is one with deep roots in British state thinking and practice.”

Neo-cons part company with “traditional conservative realists,” Gove said, “in their attachment to the maintenance of liberal Enlightenment principles in the conduct of foreign affairs.” Just as Palmerston before them, the neo-cons will use military or other interventions to support “liberal trends,” while traditional conservatives say such interventions lead to overstretch—as so obviously demonstrated now in Iraq—and subversion of state sovereignty. But what Gove hailed as neo-con “morality,” was nothing more than imperial expansion, and assault on almost all the other nations of the world. [See accompanying box on Canning and Palmerston.]

Gove traces his own political pedigree to Winston Churchill, Margaret Thatcher, and U.S. neo-con Ancient Henry (Scoop) Jackson, but moans that in the 1990s, the British Tory Party abandoned Thatcher’s policies. He has found a new hero, however: In October 2004, Gove was quoted saying: “I cannot hold it back any more: I love Tony!”