

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.