

ferred Scud missile delivery systems, and other weapons of mass destruction (WMD), to Sudan.

3. Yossef Bodansky, whom Cox indicated as her own source for her charge, in the form of a Feb. 10 report, entitled "The Iraqi WMD Challenge: Myths and Realities," prepared by the Task Force on Terrorism and Unconventional Warfare, an association composed of members of the U.S. House of Representatives, but which is not an official body of the U.S. Congress. The official director of the group is Bodansky, a former officer of the Israeli Air Force, who was the "spotter" for Jonathan Pollard, an Israeli agent convicted of espionage against the United States.

People knowledgeable on terrorism have pointed out that the U.S. air strikes against not only Khartoum, but also Afghanistan, are not expected to bring about a terrorist retreat. "On the contrary," one well-informed source told *EIR*, "it will backfire, as it will appear to prove in the minds of such people that the United States will act capriciously and arbitrarily against an Islamic target. This will only serve to recruit more terrorists. And the terrorist counterattacks will then come, against innocent Americans."

Such sentiments have been echoed among numbers of policymakers in Washington—but so far there has been no public admission of the fallacy that produced the U.S. air strike against Sudan.

Offers of cooperation spurned

Ambassador Mohamed noted in his press conference that while the United States had never initiated any diplomatic protest in regards to the Al-Shifa plant, Sudan had offered full cooperation with the United States in the fight against terrorism. In May 1998, he stated, "I delivered a formal letter of invitation to a senior official of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, offering to establish a joint effort between our external security bureau to combat international terrorism. . . . We thought our offer of cooperation with U.S. law enforcement officials would be welcomed. But after conferring with the administration, the FBI politely declined our invitation."

On the other hand, Sudan had granted the United States use of Sudan air space to evacuate wounded from Nairobi, but the ambassador expressed concern that the overflights had been used for last-minute surveillance of Al-Shifa.

The Sudanese ambassador, who departed Washington on Sept. 17, registered his frustration at the difficulties he had as ambassador in meeting with Susan Rice, in her current post as Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, or in her previous position at the National Security Council. Rice had steadfastly refused to meet the ambassador until the crisis erupted over the U.S. air strikes. According to reports, Rice had promoted a U.S. air strike against Sudan. So far, while America's relations with one of the most important countries of Africa lie in tatters, Rice and those who demanded a U.S. air strike against Sudan on the basis of flimsy if not outright false evidence, remain unscathed.

'Third Way' fuels U.S., British 'convergence'

by Mark Burdman

Repeatedly over the past months, British Prime Minister Tony Blair has promoted himself as the leading figure in a "center-left international," a so-called "Third Way." In substance, it is nothing more than an attempt to put a pseudo-human face on the brutal policies associated with his predecessor, Margaret Thatcher. Third Way has become a euphemism for the practice, typified by activities of the "New Democrats" in the United States, of abandoning traditional constituencies among blue collar workers, minorities, and others, in favor of cultivating the high-flying elements brought to the fore by the piratical policy known as "globalization."

Perhaps heed should be paid to the recent comment in the London *Times*, that Third Way would be better thought of as a "sexual rather than philosophical position."

In last week's *EIR*, Lyndon LaRouche pronounced the Third Way as, for all intents and purposes, a dead letter, at a time when the world economy is crumbling, and nation-state-, constituency-oriented approaches, like those used by U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt in the 1930s, are the only thing that will prevent a plunge into global chaos. In milder terms, *Times* chief political correspondent Peter Riddell warned Blair, in a Sept. 14 commentary, that the impact of the global economic crisis on Britain might force Blair to move away from the Third Way, and to deal with the demands of labor unions and others being badly hit by that crisis.

At present, the reality factor of global economic collapse is not stopping Blair and other utopians from pushing on with their Third Way drive. Blair's guru, London School of Economics head Anthony Giddens, released a book over the Sept. 12-13 weekend, entitled *The Third Way*. Giddens's previous work, *Beyond Left and Right*, is a bible for Third Way ideologues. In part, the new Giddens work has been prepared, in anticipation of a Sept. 21 gathering at New York University, of a conference with the theme "Strengthening Democracy in the Context of a Globalized Economy," at which the Third Way will be highlighted. Both Blair and Giddens are scheduled to participate, as is Italian Prime Minister Romano Prodi, Swedish Prime Minister Göran Persson, Bill and Hillary Clinton, a senior representative of Brazil's President Sir Fernando Henrique Cardoso, and others.

A case of extreme historical revisionism

Beyond the double-talk, Blair's Third Way drive is part of a broader effort to manipulate the United States into an

updated form of the Anglo-American “special relationship.” A convincing piece of evidence for this assertion is the following.

The Sept. 21 event in New York is being sponsored by the World Policy Institute, an entity based at New York’s New School for Social Research that aspires to the level of establishment policy influence usually associated with the New York Council on Foreign Relations. The editor of WPI’s magazine, the *World Policy Journal*, is James Chace, formerly editor of the CFR’s *Foreign Affairs* quarterly. WPI promotional literature boasts about the *Journal*’s extensive circulation among Washington officialdom and in the D.C. think-tank circuit.

A member of the *Journal*’s editorial board is Clinton White House adviser Sidney Blumenthal, described as “on leave, government service.”

In its Spring 1998 edition, the *Journal*’s lead article was written by editorial board member David Fromkin of Boston University, entitled “Churchill’s Way: The Great Convergence of Britain and the United States.” Fromkin argues in the most shameless way for a full Anglo-American “partnership,” ultimately based on the argument that American history should be seen as an extension, or mirror image, of British history. Fromkin’s is a crude rejection of “American exceptionalism,” which motivated Benjamin Franklin, John Quincy Adams, Abraham Lincoln, and other great American patriots to repudiate British methods.

Fromkin argues that the United States under Bill Clinton “ought to follow” what he calls “Churchill’s way.” This means accepting Churchill’s “spacious and attractive” view that “the English-speaking peoples were one,” and that “they should aim at some sort of unity.” Churchill, according to Fromkin, “joined to his beliefs a strategic vision in which an England that no longer could be supreme on her own could retain her greatness in a close partnership with the United States.”

This is most relevant for the present time, Fromkin asserts, because “America’s and England’s ways have converged. Bill Clinton’s United States and Tony Blair’s United Kingdom share ideals as well as national interests and strategic situation. Surely, there now is a strong case for also defining goals together, and moving toward achieving them in partnership. With the obstacles removed, we can move in the direction pointed out by Churchill.”

Among the United States’ NATO allies, Fromkin claims, “Britain uniquely shares our strategic position and outlook as an oceanic power off the shores of Europe.” Britain and the United States should “enter into a transatlantic dialogue with one another aimed at finding common solutions that may differ in some respects or at times from our land-oriented European allies.”

To bolster this strategic advice, Fromkin engages in the most disgusting historical revisionism. For example, he writes: “England was here before we were. The language and

the common law were hers before they were ours. So was constitutionalism, the underlying political faith of both countries. . . . In retrospect, we might well question the traditional American view that world history from 1776 onward should be viewed as a duel between our country and the mother country. We might well begin by noting that even the political philosophy we call our own—republican, democratic, and individualist—had its origins, in the 17th century, in Britain.” The leading figures of 1776 in America “were formed by the legal and political classics of the mother country, above all by the philosophy of John Locke.”

This is an outright lie. The Founding Fathers, in framing the Declaration of Independence, specifically rejected slavery-supporting Locke’s formula of “life, liberty, and the pursuit of property,” in favor of the *Leibnizian* concept of “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.”

Equally perverse, Fromkin portrays John Quincy Adams’s seminal Monroe Doctrine as only having been promulgated, because Adams could count on the British Navy as a “shield,” to protect the Americas from the continental European powers!

After putting forward such lies, Fromkin evolves his argument into advocacy of the notion that there has been a complete strategic symbiosis, through the decades, of the interests of the United States and Britain, as two “oceanic powers.” American and British “geopolitics” merge into one strategic vision, in the myopic author’s conception. Such admirers of British imperialism as President Theodore Roosevelt are highlighted, to bolster the general point.

Strange bedfellows

What makes the Fromkin piece all the more curious, is that recently, the most outspoken advocate of the thesis of an Anglo-American “convergence” has been Canada’s Conrad Black, owner of the Hollinger Corp. chain of newspapers. As *EIR* has reported, Black has been pushing for Britain to join the North American Free Trade Agreement, as a way of firming up that “convergence” (see *EIR*, Aug. 7, p. 24). At the same time, Black and his Hollinger interests have been the leading outlets in the “Get Clinton” media food-chain. So, he and Fromkin, writing in the center-left, nominally “pro-Clinton” *World Policy Journal*, certainly make strange bedfellows.

The same edition of the *Journal* has a tricky editorial by Chace, entitled “Bretton Woods Two?” warning of the growing dangers to the world economy, and praising the original Bretton Woods agreements, and then highlighting the proposals being made by two individuals: Harvard University “shock therapy” punk Jeffrey Sachs and Queen Elizabeth’s favorite speculator, George Soros!

One only hopes that when Sidney Blumenthal brings copies of the *World Policy Journal* into the White House, that they end up in the latrine, or President’s circular file, where they belong.