

should be linked to the broader Eurasian Land-Bridge conception, and accompanied by global financial and monetary reform, is presented in this issue (see *Feature*).

This is truly the path to peace, the alternative to Blair's road to World War III.

Documentation

'Old-fashioned British imperialism'

The Blair government's Balkans policy is a case of "old-fashioned British imperialism," and "the righteous Tony Blair" is covering up the fact that the British Empire had one of the most horrific records in history of brutal ethnic cleansing, writes British historian Richard Gott, in the May 20 London *Guardian*. Gott explicitly supports President Clinton against British attacks on Clinton's refusal to send troops to the Balkans.

Gott stresses that any sense of history would place Blair and Co. in the historical tradition of the "Limps," the "liberal imperialists" of the 19th and early 20th century. Blair is like the "pro-war Herbert Asquith," who supported the late-19th-century Boer war, "with its concentration camps and slaughter of civilians." Recollections of that "pointless and barbaric" war, explain why "almost every British historian today is in the anti-war camp."

Today's British government push for the Balkans war is "nothing new. . . . It is a throwback to the colonialism of the last century, when the imperial powers intervened at will in the affairs of independent states and peoples. Today's British Limps threaten a return to those old imperialisms, recommending intervention whenever they feel that an individual sovereign state is not behaving according to their definition of how states should behave."

Gott writes: "At first, they thought they had the United States with them, but now, finding President Clinton reluctant to engage American ground troops in a Balkan war, they pour scorn on his leadership and his failure to pick up the white man's burden. Clinton at least has some sense of history. . . ."

"Yet Tony Blair has never so much as hinted that Britain was responsible, during more than 200 years, for some of the most dreadful, institutional ethnic cleansing the world has ever seen: poisoning, shooting, slaughtering, and—yes—bombing the indigenous populations of the British Empire.

"An outsider might conclude from Britain's contemporary war fever that a powerful imperial drive still survives in the British cultural make-up."

Gott stresses, that the only way British aims in this conflict can be achieved, is by setting up a "protectorate" in Kosovo:

"This is what the Liberal imperialists now wish to construct, with the help of NATO, in the Balkans."

'Shooting President Clinton?'

Excerpts from a letter to the editor by British historian Alistar Horne, published in the London Daily Telegraph, on May 13:

Sir: For once I disagree with John Keegan in his call for the sacking of Gen. Wesley Clark. . . . Why shoot the monkey when the organ-grinder's to blame?

Though no one would advocate shooting President Clinton, it is pretty clear that, if only Congress had removed him by impeachment back in January, NATO would not now be in the mess it finds itself. . . .

. . . On a visit to the United States last month, however, I was surprised—and very disturbed—to find my American political contacts united, from Left to Right, in agreement that Clinton was the most "shamelessly bad" President on record (as one eminent former secretary of state put it), even including the disastrous Warren G. Harding.

Is it therefore any wonder that NATO puts up so feeble a performance with such an American commander-in-chief at the helm? . . .

However the Kosovo tragedy is eventually resolved . . . what one fears may be of more lasting damage will be the injury inflicted by one spineless political leader upon NATO and the Western alliance as a whole.

Alistar Horne

Henley-on-Thames, Oxon

The British espionage citadel in Washington

by Scott Thompson

With all the flap about Chinese spying in the United States, why is no one making a stink about the fact that, every day, some 400 spies of one sort or another from the British Embassy fan out throughout our nation's capital to go "prospecting for golden nuggets of intelligence," according to British Ambassador Sir Charles Meyer? Given the growing rift between the Clinton administration and Her Majesty's Blair government over the conduct of the war against Yugoslavia, among other matters, perhaps the time has come for a crack-down on the activities of the Red Coats at the British Embassy, who rely upon a post-Franklin Delano Roosevelt "special relationship," to worm their way into the inner councils of the U.S. government.

The British Embassy sits on a hill at 3100 Massachusetts Avenue, right near Observatory Circle and the home of the

U.S. Vice President. During Al Gore, Jr.'s tenure in office, as Johnathon Powell, British Prime Minister Tony Blair's Chief of Staff at 10 Downing Street, noted in an interview with *EIR* (May 14 issue), Gore has been especially close to a succession of British ambassadors. Ever since he became Vice President, Al Gore has "talked over his neighbor's fence" with the British ambassador, hosting frequent dinner parties and other festivities where the British have exercised their influence.

Some of the espionage activities of the British Embassy were revealed at a seminar on May 12 at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, where Sir Charles Meyer and other ambassadors spoke about what their job was like.

Top of the totem pole

Perhaps what drew Sir Charles out was the assertion by the Ambassador from Singapore, Chang Hang Chee, that Britain "is on the top of the diplomatic totem pole in Washington, D.C." The ambassador said that the Singapore Embassy to the United States is the largest maintained by her nation, and yet the ambassador only has a staff of 40 people. She said that this is the same size as the staff maintained by a country such as Norway.

Sir Charles said that the British Embassy has a staff of 400, and that only 12% of these people are from the civil service, known as the Foreign and Commonwealth Office. Others come from offices ranging from Defense to Trade to

Intelligence to police. He stated that at the British Embassy they have a mixture of people, who represent the entirety of the British government "in miniature."

Sir Charles said that he "had banned the use of the term 'special relationship' " to characterize U.S.-British relations by Embassy staff members, because the phrase tends to lead staff members to not work as hard as they otherwise might, to maintain Britain's special status.

In short, the British Ambassador to the United States indirectly confirmed the report by the Singapore Ambassador, that Britain does stand at the top of the "diplomatic totem pole."

Prospecting for gold

Sir Charles boasted that every day, he deploys his 400 staff members to go "prospecting," at the National Security Council, the National Economic Council, the U.S. State Department, the U.S. Department of Defense, with Republican and Democratic leaders on the Hill, and so on. At the end of the day, as his "prospectors" return, the process continues, with efforts to locate the "six or seven gold nuggets of intelligence" that go into that day's cable to 10 Downing Street. He noted that each member of the Embassy is tasked to work his or her counterparts in the U.S. government at every level, depending on their rank, so that the British government will know precisely what policies will prevail in the United States.

EIR SPECIAL REPORT

The True Story Behind The Fall of the House of Windsor

Reprints of EIR's 1994-1997 groundbreaking exposés

What political battles lie behind the assassination of Princess Diana? Why do 22 out of 30 top terrorist groups have their headquarters in London? *EIR's* series on the House of Windsor is indispensable for understanding today's news.

- The Coming Fall of the House of Windsor** (Oct. 28, 1994)
- The Sun Never Sets on the New British Empire** (May 24, 1996)
- Britain's "Invisible" Empire Unleashes the Dogs of War,** (Aug. 22, 1997)
- Epilogue: Can the House of Windsor Survive Diana's Death?** (Sept. 12, 1997)

Order from:

EIR News Service

P.O. Box 17390 Washington, D.C. 20041-0390 Order number EIR 97-004 **\$75**



Sir Charles said that his job was even more intense, in an age of rapid communications, where President Bill Clinton talks so frequently with Sir Charles's boss, Prime Minister Blair. He boasted that he could put a dispatch on the Prime Minister's desk within one-half hour. However, he said that before Prime Minister Blair would make a phone call to President Clinton, there was usually a long questionnaire sent to the British Embassy, instructing the Embassy to find out precisely what the balance of forces on the policy issue at hand was in the U.S. government and throughout the United States.

Sir Charles also mentioned the influence-peddling that is carried out through the British Embassy and its consulates in the United States. He noted that since becoming Ambassador 18 months ago, he has given more than 50 speeches throughout the United States, and the Embassy has had more than 14,000 guests at dinners, teas, and receptions.

Sir Charles said that as Ambassador to the United States, he has had to be "part saloon keeper, part pundit, and part hotelier"; the last because of the huge volume of visitors to the United States from every walk of life in Britain. He stated that only by performing these services, has he been able to maintain the vast Anglophile "networking" essential to keep Britain first and foremost in Washington.

'Lying abroad'

Sir Charles said that his favorite description of an ambassador was that "he was an honest man sent to lie abroad."

While *EIR* has no proof that Sir Charles ever was an "honest man," he clearly does "lie abroad."

This author asked Sir Charles why Blair, British Defense Secretary George Robertson, and Foreign Secretary Robin Cook had come to the United States almost two days before any other government delegation to meet with President Clinton prior to the summit for NATO's 50th anniversary. This author asked whether the purpose had been to pressure President Clinton to agree to a ground war in Kosovo; and why, after President Clinton reportedly forcefully rejected this proposal, Blair had dodged two scheduled press conferences.

This question is important, given that Foreign Secretary Cook was set to arrive in the United States on May 19, "to stiffen the Clinton administration's resolve" for a ground war.

Sir Charles replied: "Well, that was a particularly harsh question from the media. I was at the three-hour meeting between President Clinton and the Prime Minister, and I can tell you that the Prime Minister never once raised the question of ground troops. As for why Prime Minister Blair came to the U.S. 36 hours early, he had a long-standing engagement in Chicago. And, I must say, the Prime Minister did not dodge the press."

When this author tried, in a follow-up question, to point out that Blair's speech in Chicago had called for the globalization of NATO in the same way that there was a globalization now of free trade economics, the microphone was taken from my hands.

Voters look to dump Gore, and the Democratic Party should listen

by Michele Steinberg

Democratic Party leader Lyndon LaRouche, who is running for the Year 2000 Presidential nomination against Al Gore and Bill Bradley, on April 2 issued a forceful statement warning Democrats that they will fail to regain the U.S. Congress, and fail to win the Presidency, if they continue to stick to the so-called "Gore legacy."

LaRouche said, "World economic depression is already under way. Worldwide war is already threatened. It is time for a change in the way things have been going. Don't just support a candidate. Support a change. The world, this nation, and you badly need that change."

"It is currently estimated among relevant Party circles, that the Democratic Party generally will tacitly recognize Gore's unelectability by this coming summer," continued LaRouche, anticipating that "some other Democratic candi-

dates will appear on the list."

LaRouche pointed out that "A crisis far worse than 1929-1932 is in progress inside the U.S.A. itself. . . . The world's needs cry out for a U.S. leader with the outlook and commitments of a Franklin Delano Roosevelt. U.S. candidates who are not committed to policies and outlooks like those of Roosevelt are of little use to the United States, or the world as a whole today. For the moment, I am the only visible candidate who meets that standard."

During two weeks in mid-May, LaRouche's forecast that Gore's liability as a candidate would be widely recognized within the Democratic Party by the summer, began to hit with gale force.

Gore continues to plummet in the frequent election polls. The latest poll on May 13 shows him losing to George W.