

Editorial

Two doctrines on the table

Reports from Tony Blair's April 21 speech in Chicago, Illinois indicate that the British Prime Minister attempted to follow in the tradition of Maggie "Iron Lady" Thatcher, and Winston "Iron Curtain" Churchill. The brash Blair issued a "Doctrine of International Community" which amounts to a reassertion of British imperialism, cloaked in the mantle of "free trade," democratization, NATO expansion, and other such "reforms."

In sharp contrast is the other doctrine on the table, that presented by Lyndon LaRouche on April 7. The "LaRouche Doctrine," which was issued to address the strategic crisis reflected in the war in the Balkans, calls for a "new system of strategic partnership among perfectly sovereign nation-states," which he calls a New Bretton Woods.

The choice which the United States, both citizens and President, make between these two doctrines is going to be decisive for the future of civilization itself.

Blair's "doctrine" is an unabashed attempt to stamper President Clinton, and therefore the rest of NATO, into a new assertion of global diktat. The Prime Minister is demanding unconditional surrender by Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic, and Blair has been accurately quoted as saying, during a manic takeover of a Brussels NATO press conference early in the week, that the assault would continue until Milosevic "steps down." Such an assertion of "will" is presented as the first step in a new internationalism. As Blair put it in Chicago: "The most pressing foreign policy problem we face is to identify the circumstances in which we should get actively involved in other people's conflicts. Non-interference has long been considered an important principle of international order. And it is not one we would want to jettison too readily. . . . But the principle of non-interference must be qualified in important respects."

At the same time, Blair and his cabinet members are pressing hard for a NATO decision to deploy ground troops in Kosovo. The role that Blair has been assigned

to play is being spelled out repeatedly in both the London press and the *Wall Street Journal*. Like Margaret Thatcher in 1990, who flew to the United States to ensure that President Bush wouldn't allow peace negotiations with Iraq, Blair is to make sure that President Clinton does not "go wobbly," and seek peace.

LaRouche's Doctrine, which we printed two issues ago, puts the blame squarely on the British for having created the war in the Balkans, using the pretext of humanitarian atrocities. The aim of this assertion of power — whose targets are Russia and China, in particular — is, to quote LaRouche, to create "a new worldwide British Empire, an empire constituted by assimilating the U.S.A. components of BAC [the British-American-Commonwealth oligarchs] into de facto integration within a new world empire based upon the Commonwealth as such, rather than an empire of the previously quasi-autonomous member-nations of the Commonwealth. This thrust for world-empire was conducted under the deceptive terminology of 'globalization.'" If the British are successful, LaRouche argues, it will mean global war.

The only way to prevent such a disaster is to address the root cause of the crisis, i.e., the bankrupt financial system, LaRouche argues. The remedy, he says, requires that President Clinton take emergency action to establish an essentially global New Bretton Woods agreement, and "a general partnership of economic and other cooperation with the group of states now developing a system of partnership among China, Russia, India, et al. The objective should be those anti-British policies which U.S. President Franklin Roosevelt intended to be the basis for a just, imperialism-free form of new world economic order among perfectly sovereign nation-states enjoying free access to the most advanced discoveries in science and technology."

The LaRouche Doctrine means economic development; the Blair Doctrine means war. Which one will you choose?