

for the challenge of globalization, which Blair calls the “defining economic movement of our time.” His party is unashamedly a “pro-free trade party,” but if such policies cause any problems, such as shutting down industries and mass unemployment, he has some neo-Fabian confetti to wave about, to cover over the holes. That Blair concurs with Conservative Howell on this point, is symptomatic of a growing convergence of Fabians and Thatcherites, on “dismantling the welfare state”; Blair is frequently praised by such neo-conservative mouthpieces as the *Times*’s Rees-Mogg, and is openly collaborating with the arch-Thatcherite Adam Smith Institute in London on his “welfare reform” schemes.

A spokesman for Blair, quoted in the British press, said that “left-of-center thinking across the world” has to be “reshaped,” with stress on low inflation, open trade, “proper” infrastructure, public-private relationships, competitive tax rates, and “above all investment in people as our main resource.” This includes strict continuance of the brutal destruction of Britain’s trade unions under Margaret Thatcher.

In Singapore on Jan. 7-8, there was more. Here, Blair ran on about a “stakeholder economy where everyone has a chance to get on and succeed, where there is a clear sense of national purpose and where we leave behind some of the battles between left and right which really are not relevant in the global economy today.”

Blair’s vision of “the economic justification for social cohesion” is a globalist version of Mussolini’s 1930s corporatism, this time with an ostensibly “Asiatic” flavor. “The creation of an economy where we are inventing and producing goods and services of high quality,” Blair intoned, “needs the engagement of the whole country. It must become a matter of national purpose and national pride.” “Trust” will come from “the recognition of a mutual purpose for which we work together and in which we all benefit.”

Yet there is an interesting note about the Singaporean enforced “savings” policy so praised by Britain’s leaders. The Central Provident Fund was originally set up under British colonial rule in Singapore, in 1955. (British rule in Malaya and Singapore only ended—without a revolution—in 1957.) The original Fund policy was to collect 5% from workers’ salaries, split between the worker and employer, as enforced savings. The policy was then adopted and expanded by Lee Kuan Yew when Singapore became independent from Malaysia. Lee Kuan Yew upped the contributions to 40% of earnings, still split between worker and employer, but the worker gets only 2.5% interest on his “savings.” Since there is no other social security or health care system in Singapore, the funds are used as pensions and health insurance, and can be used for funding mortgages and investments in stocks. After retirement, restrictions are imposed on when a worker can withdraw his savings, and how he can spend them. The \$40 billion Fund, meanwhile, is used by the government for building up Singapore.

Shubeilat’s trial begins in Jordan

by Our Special Correspondent

On the day that Jordanian King Hussein left Amman for Tel Aviv, to take part in an award-giving ceremony there, a trial opened in the Hashemite capital, on whose outcome the fate of democracy in that country will depend. On Jan. 10, the president of the Jordanian Engineers Association, and former independent Islamist parliamentarian, Laith Shubeilat, went before a State Security Court, on charges of *lèse majesté*, and of undermining the national currency and economy. The first day in court ended early, after defense lawyer Jawad Yunis called for the judge to be recused, on grounds of political bias. The case was adjourned to Jan. 14.

Since he was arrested on Dec. 9, Shubeilat has been treated like a common criminal, although the charges against him are classified as misdemeanors, not felonies. In utter disregard for the law and for basic human rights, Shubeilat was held in solitary confinement, and not allowed to meet his wife or lawyer, until major protests had been lodged. Although the law prescribes it for misdemeanors, he was denied release on bail or recognizance. When he was allowed to meet with his lawyer, it was only in the presence of security guards. A trial date was set for Jan. 8, but neither the accused nor his lawyer was informed in time. It was only after Yunis, who heard from a journalist friend on Jan. 7 that BBC radio had announced the trial would start the following day, had vigorously protested, that a new date was set for Jan. 10. Only on Jan. 9 was Shubeilat allowed to meet with his lawyer alone.

International protests

For these and other reasons linked to the politics of the case, a chorus of protests has been heard from around the world. Parliamentarians from Spain, Argentina, the Dominican Republic, as well as leading academicians and human rights activists from Russia and Ukraine, issued statements to the Jordanian authorities, demanding the immediate liberation of Shubeilat. In Denmark, Germany, France, England, Sweden, and Italy, similar protests were lodged at the Jordanian embassies. Embassy personnel reported that they had been flooded with calls about the case, and were referring them to Amman. Russian human rights activist Viktor Kuzin

wrote a letter personally to King Hussein, detailing the violations of Shubeilat's rights that have occurred. "All this," he wrote, "causes 'the Shubeilat affair' to be viewed exclusively as a pretext for removing the accused from the public scene, especially in light of the circumstance, that the accused, in the recent period, has been at the center of an intense public discussion, concerning the activity of the International Monetary Fund, and is well known for his principled criticism of the 'free market economy' model, brought into Jordan by the latter."

The reason why the Shubeilat case has raised such an outcry abroad, has to do with the fact, that the accused is known to be the standard-bearer of the fight against World Bank-International Monetary Fund (IMF) policies in the region. Thus, political personalities in countries like Russia, Ukraine, Poland, or any of the Ibero-American nations, which have all been put on the IMF chopping block, have no difficulty in sympathizing with his fight.

The implications of the case, however, go beyond the anti-IMF fight. Lyndon LaRouche addressed the issue in an interview with "EIR Talks" on Jan. 10. "First of all," LaRouche said, "Laith's problem comes principally from London. And the Jordan government is operating, as is the World Bank in this Middle East area, under directions from British intelligence, the British monarchy."

LaRouche continued: "This is similar to what happened back when Henry Kissinger was first on watch in the National Security Council as national security adviser, during which time the British were orchestrating the situation in the Middle East, and in Washington, through Kissinger, their agent in Washington, to bring about what became known as the Black September massacres. And, a similar state of mind is being induced in the king of Jordan through these kinds of things that were induced by London, with the help of Kissinger, back in the time of that—leading up to the Black September case.

"Now, this is complicated by a second feature, which is highlighted by the question of the Saudi succession that we've mentioned before, that the vicissitudes of aging have caught up with King Fahd, and with Prince Abdullah. Abdullah has succeeded Fahd. Abdullah is closer to Syria and the Brits than he is, say, to the United States. . . .

"All of this goes into the question of a very special category of policy, U.S. and British policy, which is called *the geopolitics of Middle East oil*, in which the relationships of the governments of the two countries in respect to arms sales and other political matters into Saudi Arabia, becomes crucial.

"So, the shift in the Saudi situation, and the Gulf situation generally, which determines the flow of petroleum money into Arab states, is a crucial factor in this situation. And, as the Clinton administration and the United States lose position, relatively, through attrition and other means, through

British dirty operations through the so-called Arab Bureau channels, then you get complications, where the Middle East peace is in trouble, because of British intelligence operations: partly Lally Weymouth's buddy there, Ariel Sharon, who is a vicious killer, his friends are vicious killers, who were, in a sense, politically behind what became the assassination of Yitzhak Rabin; and the World Bank operation, which is another operation, which is *crushing* Middle East peace development.

"Now, technically, Laith Shubeilat, my friend, is among those who oppose the Middle East peace in its present form, on the grounds that he, and others like him, do not believe that the present Middle East peace is workable, that it will blow up. And therefore, they're opposed to sacrificing anything, in terms of strategic position, for the Middle East peace, because they don't believe it's going to be there. They believe it's going to be defeated, as by the World Bank.

"Now, Shubeilat's alleged crime is his attack on the World Bank policies, World Bank policies which ensure that the Middle East peace will blow up.

"At present, the United States government, or at least the State Department, is supporting the World Bank position, which means that President Clinton's policy for Middle East peace is being shot down, not only by the Brits, but by his own State Department, and, perhaps, some elements of his Democratic National Committee campaign organization.

"So therefore, Shubeilat was charged with *lèse majesté*, for attacking the imposition on Jordan and other countries of the World Bank conditionalities, conditionalities which are going to destroy Middle East peace.

"Now, if you understand the logic of what I just said, it is perfectly consistent, that my friend Laith, who is president of the Engineers Society of Jordan, while he doesn't trust a Middle East peace and therefore opposes it for that reason, nonetheless will fight for the realization of a Middle East peace, by attacking the World Bank which, he points out, means that the Middle East peace won't work.

"So, some people say that the king is supporting Middle East peace. The king is *not* supporting Middle East peace, because he's supporting the World Bank. Why is he supporting the World Bank? In part, because Jordan depends on money from other sources, including Saudi sources and Gulf sources. Who controls those sources? Well, now it's the friends of George Bush and other British agents, including the British themselves, who are coming into a dominant position.

"So the complexities of the geopolitics of oil, and the complexities of the fight within the United States, on whether we're going to have an independent policy as a nation-state, or whether we're going to become a clown, or a clone, perhaps, for the British, which is the Bush policy and the policy of Gingrich, which of those two policies is going to prevail. Laith is caught in the middle."