
International Intelligence

U.K. Historian Razes Tony Blair's 'Image'

British military historian Corelli Barnett demolished the “image” of Tony Blair in the *Daily Mail* on July 23. “Does he actually share the dangerous vision of doctrinaire hawks such as [U.S. Deputy Defense Secretary] Paul Wolfowitz and [Vice President] Dick Cheney, of a world reshaped on America’s model, through the exercise of sheer military and economic power? And did he really mean to publicly commit the United Kingdom in principle to taking part in future pre-emptive American attacks, on the members of the ‘axis of evil’?” wrote Barnett.

“Does this colossal contrast between Blair the actor of the part of a great prime minister, and the reality of an incompetent and emotional man, account for his all-too-evident mood swings? When things have gone wrong for him before, during, and since the Iraq War, whenever his critics have pressed him hard, we have seen him haggard-faced, hollow-eyed, shrunken within his suit. Yet a day later, he will appear pink and well-fleshed, and perform his role masterfully, whether it be in the House of Commons, or in some carefully arranged cozy photo opportunity.”

Barnett concluded, “But to me, as a military historian who has studied top commanders under stress, Tony Blair’s emotional nature, his love of role playing, his intellectual rambling, and his rapid mood-swings from deep anxiety to euphoric certainty are all truly disquieting. He is, after all, our Prime Minister—at present.”

German Media Break Silence on Straussians

The U.S. cabal around Vice President Dick Cheney, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, and his Deputy Paul Wolfowitz, and its adherence to the “noble lie” philosophy of the University of Chicago’s Leo Strauss in justifying war on Iraq, has come under closer scrutiny in Strauss’s homeland, Germany. The usually pro-Anglo-American press is trying a rearguard defense of

Strauss—who was forced to leave Nazi Germany because he was Jewish—by conceding that Strauss had close ties to Nazi “Court Jurist” Carl Schmitt. However the weekly *Der Spiegel*, the daily *Die Welt*, and the *Financial Times Germany* may have tried to spin it, they are responding to *The Children of Satan: The ‘Ignoble Liars’ Behind Bush’s No-Exit War*, a pamphlet commissioned for international circulation by U.S. Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche. Its German translation has sold out both in Germany, and in Switzerland and Austria.

The Aug. 4 issue of *Der Spiegel* applied the spin that Strauss was rescued from being besmirched of Nazi leanings when his correspondence with Schmitt was disrupted. Schmitt (who used his Rockefeller Foundation connections to get Strauss out of Germany) ended up being “entangled” with the Nazi state.

On Aug. 5, the *Financial Times Germany* wrote “Neo-Cons Around Wolfowitz Determine U.S. Diplomacy,” pointing out that 60 Straussians hold an annual barbecue in Washington. The paper named Bush Administration officials Paul Wolfowitz, Doug Feith, Abram Shulsky, Richard Perle, John Walters, and Leon Krass. Neo-con policies, now adopted and pushed by Cheney and Rumsfeld since Sept. 11, began in the last decade with the Project for a New American Century, wrote the *Times*.

The capstone was *Die Welt*’s Aug. 5 editorial. Also trying to be dismissive, under the headline “Strauss Is To Blame for Everything,” the editorial acknowledged: “It is not solely the campaign of Presidential candidate LaRouche, which calls the neo-cons ‘children of Satan,’ that are causing problems for Straussians like Perle and Wolfowitz.”

A second edition of the German *Children of Satan* is set to appear this month.

Britain Went to ‘War Under False Pretenses’

Britain’s formal inquiry into the July 17 death of Dr. David Kelly—which police ruled a suicide—opened on Aug. 11, under the gavel of Lord Hutton, former Lord Chief Justice of Northern Ireland. Kelly, the coun-

try’s top expert on Iraqi weapons of mass destruction, harbored grave reservations regarding Prime Minister Tony Blair’s official allegations about the “Iraqi WMD threat.”

Two commentaries in the Aug. 13 *Guardian* got to the point, especially the op-ed by leading Labour Party figure Lord Roy Hattersley, “A War Fought Under False Pretences.” He said that the opening session “got very close to . . . the heart of the inquiry. . . . If we had known in March what we know today, neither the House of Commons nor the British people would have supported the decision to go to war.” Dr. Kelly “knew more about Saddam’s weapons program than anyone else in Britain—perhaps anyone else in the world. He was neither a fantasist nor a fraud, but an acknowledged international expert. And he believed that the [Blair government] claims were exaggerated. . . .

“Britain was asked to go to war, because we and our allies faced a real and present danger. But only in the world of might have been. Nothing the inquiry reveals in future can be more important than the single fact that it demonstrated last Monday. The government exaggerated the threat from Iraq. If it had given the country an honest account of the danger, the outcry against military action would have been too great for the government to resist, or the Prime Minister to survive.”

BBC’s Rod Liddle reported that the Hutton inquiry is revealing “this government will do anything it possibly can, to wriggle off the charge that it deliberately misled Parliament and the public, over the severity of the threat posed by Iraq. It will dissemble, obfuscate and mislead the public. It will vilify and attempt to destroy the reputation or career of anyone who stands in its way. . . . It will rewrite history and hope, in the meantime, that nobody notices.”

No one, said Liddle, could possibly doubt the exposé of BBC Defense Correspondent Andrew Gilligan, who publicly charged that the government had “sexed up” its September 2002 dossier on Iraqi WMDs. Kelly, Liddle stressed, “was more aghast than most” in the security services, over what had been done to the dossier, since he had been “exactly as Gilligan asserted, the country’s foremost expert who had actually proofread the thing!”