

Behind Butler Report: The LaRouche Issue

by Katharine Kanter

As readers will be well aware, the so-called Butler Report was published on July 14, almost one year to the day from the alleged suicide of weapons-inspection expert and BBC “informant” Dr. David Kelly. Its publication also happens to coincide with a front-page leak to the *London Times* through someone described as a “senior” American official, according to whom the U.S. Government is now considering an attack on Iran in order to destroy that nation’s civil nuclear program, to which Russia is currently delivering fuel rods.

Bearing in mind—lest we had forgotten—that over one million human beings have died in Iraq as a direct consequence of the two Gulf Wars and sanctions since 1990; and also, that before the second Gulf War was launched in 2003, mass protests against it were staged by millions of people throughout Great Britain, the Butler Report’s publication has given rise to a stream of contradictory political assessments, all rotating round one issue: Will the report provide enough ammunition to get Tony Blair out?

Or, as Jonathan Freedlander (who, perhaps not surprisingly, is the author of the essay published in 1999, “Bring Home the Revolution: The Case for a British Republic”) put it in *The Guardian* July 15: “Some thought the headline was ‘Blair slammed’, others said it was ‘Whitewash II.’ It might take a while to sink in that Lord Butler had done neither. . . . He presented parliament, press and public with an elegant, nut-encased, velvet-lined box full of sharpened knives. ‘You might use these,’ he seemed to say, ‘I couldn’t possibly’. . . . He did not play the assassin. Instead he handed the PM [Blair] a bulletproof vest, and the public a set of live bullets. That at least will ensure fair play—and what could be more British than that?”

Other analysts in Great Britain have commented—notably the *Guardian*’s political editor Michael White—that the actual reason the Butler Report stops short of pinning the responsibility for “seriously flawed” intelligence on John Scarlett or any single mandarin, is in order not to “let the biggest players off the hook, notably Tony Blair and his chief of staff Jonathan Powell.”

The paucity of intelligence material on which the Government relied in its rush to war, is itself an insult to the erstwhile-famed intelligence of the British people. Accord-



“The Butler Report’s publication has given rise to a stream of contradictory political assessments, all rotating round one issue: Will the report provide enough ammunition to get Tony Blair out?”

ing to the Report, MI6 had but 5 main sources in 2002, most or all of whom have been openly acknowledged by that Service to be relaying hearsay and “Chinese whispers”. *Inter alia*, the Butler Report describes as “unsafe,” so-called intelligence passed on by a middleman who had made the claim that Iraqi WMD could be battle-ready within 45 minutes.

It further transpires from the Report, that in July 2003, intelligence items supplied by some MI6 sources were “withdrawn” as unreliable—*ex post facto*—from the Iraq dossier, although neither Sir Richard Dearlove, then head of MI6, nor John Scarlett, the service’s newly-appointed head who chaired, at that time, the Joint Intelligence Committee, troubled to inform the Hutton Enquiry of that fact. (Lord Hutton headed the eponymous Committee enquiring into David Kelly’s alleged suicide).

Does England Still Exist as a Nation?

Great Britain has no written Constitution. In 1854, the famous Northcote-Trevelyan Report on the Organization of the Permanent Civil Service set out a blueprint for civil service principles, the chiefest of which was neutrality. A civil servant was to be loyal to the Crown, as a permanent complex of interests, not to a Government. However, the notion of loyalty to the Crown is one of the most vexed issues in English constitutional law. Does it mean loyalty to the interests of England as a nation, to the Empire, to the Monarchy as an Institution? Modern interpretations, under the influence of the American Revolution, have tended towards the first of those.

Judged by that standard, the late Dr. David Kelly was a loyal servant to the Crown, while the Butler Report confirms a statement of intent by Blair’s secretary Jonathan Powell in 1997, that the Blair regime was to become “a more Napoleonic (read imperial) system.” According to Lord Butler, the War policy was worked out in the course of “frequent but unscripted” meetings at which—a flagrant breach of civil service practice—no notes were taken, and

where official papers from the Ministerial departments concerned were neither circulated nor, it seems, even read. In the year before War broke out, the Ministerial Committee on Defence and Overseas Policy met not one single time.

The Butler report can thus be read as a profile of the *modus operandi* of that tiny, trans-Atlantic group of perfervid imperialists around PM Blair and Vice-President Cheney, that has conducted a cold coup d'état, arrogating to themselves every major policy decision, including the right to decide, unconstitutionally, War and Peace.

Be that as it may, and according to Simon Jenkins in Thursday's *Times*, on July 13, in the Royal Courts of Justice, a group he calls "the most powerful freemasonry in Britain" assembled to discuss the Butler Report. United in their hostility to Blair, the cream of the civil service—permanent heads of the offices of State, the law lords Woolf, Phillips and Goldsmith, the queen's private secretary, the head of the Foreign Office, the Lord Chancellor, and so forth, gathered, writes Jenkins, "as Drake at bowls before the Armada, the Duchess of Richmond's ball before Waterloo, Washington on the banks of the Potomac."

Most likely as a result of that meeting in the Royal Courts of Justice, the First Division Association, the union that represents the Civil Service elite, issued a statement on July 15, demanding reform of Cabinet practice, and describing the Government as being "run like a tabloid newspaper."

The Butler Report calls for the new MI6 Chief to be someone "demonstrably beyond influence," which is Civil-Service Speak for saying that John Scarlett, Chairman of the Joint Intelligence Committee (JIC), and one of the chief purveyors of the polluted September 2002 dossier of information to the public, was demonstrably under political influence, an accusation tantamount to that of corruption. One would accordingly have expected John Scarlett to resign, but, at least at the time of writing, he is still to take over as head of MI6 on August 1; while Sir Richard Dearlove, the post's current incumbent, is named Master of Pembroke College, Cambridge.

Foreign Aggression Spells Domestic Unrest

Within the next eight weeks, a radical reform of the domestic intelligence service MI5 will be underway. The plan, that explicitly targets British Muslims in the Northern cities of Great Britain, involves setting up a new network of secret intelligence bases outside London for the first time, to combat what is being sold the British public as domestic insurgency. Since Prime Minister Thatcher wrecked British manufacturing industry in the 1980s, England's Northern cities, home to millions of dark-skinned British citizens whose parents emigrated from the Indian subcontinent after the War, have been the scene of unrest, including rioting in the streets, due to mass unemployment and the attendant racialism.

That being the environment, this new MI5 domestic deployment—apparently a carbon-copy of the American

Homeland Security measures—is very plainly designed to crush protest at depression conditions, as well as any form of political dissidence, that shall henceforth referred to as "subversion." All intelligence will be passed through a new secure electronic system, directly to the Joint Terrorism Analysis Centre set up after September 11, 2001.

MI5 has enjoyed a "substantial" budget increase over the last twelve months, and is in the midst of a recruiting campaign to increase staff by 50% by 2008, up to roughly 3,000 operatives, which will mean outgrowing its London headquarters, Thames House. Although secret, MI5's share of the budget is estimated to be roughly 200 billion pounds.

In this precise context, the Director for Public Prosecutions, Ken MacDonald, told the *Times* last week that he is seeking sweeping new powers, including the right to hold suspects without charge for longer periods, and to question persons "under compulsion," without however, clarifying whether that might mean torture.

Though the intelligence services may plot to do away with politics, the LaRouche issue will not go away.

Thus have the intelligence services come to play an overweening role in national life, replacing, indeed, actual politics. Leaving aside the details of the MI5 reform described, and the Hutton and Butler Reports, that have given rise to a new term "Buttonism" taken to mean "absolving high officials of personal responsibility," that is the most disturbing implication of the present state of British and American politics.

At a public meeting held this past March at Westminster University, hosted by Alice Mahon MP, and attended by former Weapons Inspector Scott Ritter and the Welsh MP Adam Price, both Ritter and Price warned the public that not only is the war, and the conduct of the war in Iraq, illegal and unconstitutional: The fact that certain Western elites be *allowed* by their citizenry to behave in so grossly immoral a fashion, will shortly spell the end of representative democracy, unless each of us take our responsibility to change this state of affairs.

What the projected MI5 anti-insurgency plan shows is how these vultures have indeed come home to roost; and we were well advised to draw the consequences, with all due dispatch.

The dilemma facing the American and British elites, is that even those who are gravely concerned about the consequences for world peace should the status quo in the Western World be maintained, are well aware that ridding the world of that clique means vindicating Lyndon LaRouche, and, very possibly, bringing either LaRouche himself or a faction very closely associated with him to power in the U.S.A., with all the sweeping economic and financial reforms that would entail. Are they that committed to the welfare of their nation? Are they prepared to go that far? That is, no doubt, the real issue behind the dithering and vacillating over the implications of the Butler Report.