

all of these are pathways to enrichment through tricks and thievery. There is no place here for investment in production, since it is possible to make money out of thin air. Today's rich men are proud of it. In Roosevelt's time, and long before him, there were other parasitical tendencies. They were one of the main causes of the crisis in the 1930s, known in the West as the Great Depression. When Roosevelt said, "Live better," he meant it in the sense you do, Andrei Ivanovich, in presenting your programmatic strategy, "produce-sell-buy-produce."

**Nikolayev:** There is another of Roosevelt's sayings that we adopted, which may be rephrased like this: "Russia should buy abroad, only what it cannot produce itself." There was a time when Americans generally said: We won't drive European or Japanese cars, we'll only drive American cars, because we produce those cars. That's their psychology. We, however, walk around in American clothes — that's our psychology. This shows what respect we have for our own producers.

**Muranivsky:** Andrei Ivanovich, what would you like to say in conclusion?

**Nikolayev:** Political and economic life today is multi-faceted: There are communist viewpoints, liberal viewpoints, socialist and social-democratic viewpoints, and various views of economic systems. Some recognize communist state property, state management and planning, while others look to private property and economic levers. We take into account the difference between state property and private property, and between state planning and market planning. What do we propose? State strategic planning and forecasting, state property, economic levers, private property, joint-stock property, collective property. That is the whole scheme of things. We should create a general plan, like the Americans and the Japanese and the Germans. . . .

**Muranivsky:** The way de Gaulle did.

**Nikolayev:** As de Gaulle did in France. State property, which defines our security, economic levers, which flow from state planning and strategic forecasting, and private property, functioning within that framework. We reject the adoption of any single model. We recognize a totality of models.

**Muranivsky:** You reject extremes?

**Nikolayev:** We won't find a way out, from extreme radical positions. Who, today, is going to deny the need for collective property, or joint-stock property? Nobody. Who is going to deny the need for private property, where it is the most effective form?

**Muranivsky:** Many thanks for this interesting and substantial discussion. I am happy that our views coincide in many areas. The most important is that we believe our problems can be solved with our own forces.

## Manic Blair reveals Britain's real agenda

by Mary Burdman

British Prime Minister Tony Blair's claims to galactic supremacy are being challenged — most notably by the governments of France and Germany, but also within Britain, and even the Labour Party itself — and, typically, Blair is plunging into a flight forward. Reacting like a brat stung by the pointed questions of a knowing peer, Blair bragged shamelessly of his "inner knowledge," and, in a speech in the City of London on Nov. 22, he revealed the inner workings of the modern-day British-American-Commonwealth bloc.

Blair cast away all the myths of Britain as a post-imperial nation living out its quaint heritage, and his remarks show that "cool" Britannia is actually the highly manipulative world power-broker, that *EIR* has consistently documented it to be. Britain, Blair said, is a "pivotal power . . . that is at the crux of the alliances and international politics which shape the world and its future," sitting at the center of such international institutions as the Commonwealth, the United Nations, NATO, and the Group of Eight, and also proud host of the world's largest financial center, the City of London.

Yet, despite his boasting, Blair has had a particularly galling time recently. The week of Nov. 15, there was an open challenge to his "invincibility" in British politics, coming from the more traditional wing of his Labour Party. The opposition Conservative (Tory) Party — which had been vanquished in the May 1997 elections by Blair, economic collapse, and its own rampant corruption — had been re-asserting itself, as the disastrous results of "New Labour's" own economic policies were exposed, especially by the Paddington Station train disaster of Oct. 5. Now, suddenly, the Tories have been hit by one scandal after another, leading party chairman Michael Ancram to accuse the government of running a "dirty tricks" campaign and creating a "climate of fear" in Britain.

Even worse for Blair, there is a growing reaction against his disastrous "Third Way" policies, both economic and political, among other European leaders. Led by French Prime Minister Lionel Jospin, a Socialist, they stopped the British Prime Minister in his tracks at the Nov. 20-21 summit of Western leaders in Florence.

Blair, immediately upon returning home from Florence, went to the banquet of the Lord Mayor of the City of London, to re-assert his status as supreme ruler of the universe. The City of London has found Blair to be a most useful tool for their interests so far; it remains to be seen how long he will remain so.

## The pivotal power

Britain has “a new role, . . . to use the strengths of our history to build our future . . . as a pivotal power, as a power that is at the crux of the alliances and international politics which shape the world and its future,” Blair said at Guildhall. He referred to what he had said on “The Doctrine of International Community,” in Chicago in April — perhaps the single most revealing event of the NATO 50th anniversary summit — where Blair claimed that, from the British standpoint, the war against Yugoslavia was the “entry-point” for a new global imperial system.

“As was clear in Florence, Britain is at the forefront of the debate about new ideas in modern progressive politics,” Blair said. “One such vital debate is about Britain’s role in the world. . . .

“For Britain, the legacy of Empire remains profound. . . . Nearly 40 years ago, [U.S. Secretary of State] Dean Acheson’s barb — that Britain had lost an Empire but not yet found a role — struck home. Successive generations of British politicians tried — unsuccessfully — to find a way back.”

But where even Tory Prime Ministers Winston Churchill and Margaret Thatcher had failed, Blair is claiming success: “I believe that search can now end,” he asserted. “We have got over our imperial past. . . . No longer do we want to be taken seriously just for our history, but for what we are and what we will become. We have a new role. Not to look back and try to re-create ourselves as the pre-eminent superpower of 1900, nor to pretend to be the Greeks to the Americans’ Romans.

“It is to use the strengths of our history to build our future not as a superpower but as a pivotal power, as a power that is at the crux of the alliances and international politics which shape the world and its future. . . .

“Britain’s potential strengths are clear, in some ways unique. First, our formidable network of international contacts. Our extraordinarily close relations with nations in every part of the globe through the Commonwealth . . . the UN Security Council, of NATO and of the G-8. The close relationship forged through two world wars and the Cold War with the U.S.A. And our crucial membership of the European Union [EU]. We are at the pivot of all these inter-connecting alliances and groupings.”

Second, he claimed, is Britain’s economic role. Its new “strength” comes in part from what Thatcher did in the 1980s and in part from what “New Labour” has done since. Then comes the role of Britain’s armed forces in the Gulf War, Bosnia, Kosovo, and East Timor, especially “their leading role in Kosovo,” Blair said.

People still “underestimate the impact of globalization,” Blair said. “Economic frontiers are crashing down. One and a half trillion dollars are traded every day on the world’s currency exchanges, of which by far the biggest is right here in the City of London,” which is “bigger than the Tokyo and New York markets put together. . . . This transformation of

the world by economics has been coupled with a sudden shift in the international political agenda. . . . In this post-Cold War era, it is not just economics that is global. It is politics too. . . . In every sphere, increasingly nations are having to accept they can only advance their own interests by working with others.

“Yet, in Europe and America, there are some who argue that the end of the Cold War in fact opens the door to a new era of national sovereignty, . . . [that] nation-states can again afford to withdraw from international commitments, to act unilaterally rather than in partnership.”

This argument is wrong, Blair asserted, putting forward his globalist view: “By working together, nation-states can extend their authority. . . . Even a superpower like the United States cannot afford unilateralism. Like other nations, it has to work through the international institutions from NAFTA [North American Free Trade Agreement], and the OSCE [Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe], to the WTO [World Trade Organization] and the UN to get its way.”

“The key for Britain,” he asserted, “is that we build and shape alliances to give us strength and influence to advance our own national interests; to make the most of our potential. And not just for Britain, but for the world.”

Britain should not be “mesmerized by the choice between the U.S. and Europe. It is a false choice. The fact is that we are listened to more closely in Washington if we are leading in Europe. And we have more weight in Europe if we are listened to in Washington. My vision for Britain is as a bridge between the EU and the U.S.A. Our two powers have common interests that dwarf the things we often argue about.

“The EU and the U.S. standing together, coming closer, is the single most urgent priority for the new international order,” Blair stated. Britain “can be a power that is pivotal, dynamic, capable through the alliances we have of shaping and influencing our and the world’s future destiny.”

## Upheavals in Albion

Blair made this speech amidst one of the wildest situations in Britain in some time. On June 18, thousands of rioters had rampaged through the City of London in the worst violence there since the “Gordon riots” of the 1780s. This “anarchist” operation was actually highly organized, including via the Internet. Just a month later, an article in the London *Sunday Times* revealed the existence of “Operation Surety,” emergency contingency plans for dealing with large-scale civil disorder and chaos in the United Kingdom, a situation likely to erupt under conditions of a broad financial crash.

Nov. 30 was the next set of anarchist riots, this time as part of the “global day of action” against globalization at the WTO meeting in Seattle. In London, the target was Railtrack, the company that oversees Britain’s privatized rail system, whose failure to maintain the railroad’s infrastructure led to the Paddington disaster. In response, the City of London and Metropolitan Police set up a “unified command structure.”

This time, the riots turned out to be a little more than

*British Prime Minister Tony Blair proclaims that Britain's new role is "as a pivotal power, as a power that is at the crux of the alliances and international politics which shape the world and its future."*



### The Third Way (or: the three faces of Mr. Tony Blair)



a “damp squib.” Peaceful demonstrations by about 1-2,000 people at Euston Station, were disrupted in the evening by at most 100-150 hard-core rioters, who were soon controlled by the police.

The entire scenario is reminiscent of the methods of Oliver Cromwell, who, to maintain his dictatorial powers during the 17th-century Commonwealth, deployed “rangers” all over England. These rabble-rousers would go from town to town, demanding anarchy and, of course, the fall of Cromwell—whose political support was greatly strengthened as a result.

Then, on Nov. 23, the British press revealed that the authorities have been put on a terror alert because of an alleged “credible and real threat” of attacks within England by “dissident factions” of the Irish Republican Army, during the year-end holiday season and millennium celebrations. The authorities have already briefed 25 to 30 top British companies on the threat, and have increased security around the City and Dockland areas of London.

Most interesting, in this context, was an article in the London *Guardian* on Nov. 25 on the City of London, a distinct, 800-year-old political/economic entity, ruled by its own Lord Mayor and Corporation, and protected, since 1993, by a “ring of steel.” Under Blair’s New Labour, the City’s defenses are being strongly reinforced.

### Old Labour

But there are reactions to New Labour’s “draconian and chilly” agenda, as old Labourite Roy Hattersly characterized the Labour-dictated Queen’s Speech at the opening of Parliament on Nov. 17. Notable is the intra-party brawl between Blair’s clique and the more traditional wing of the party, over the shortlist of Labour candidates for the first elections for Mayor of London (as distinct from the City’s own appointed Lord Mayor). On Nov. 18, Labour Member of Parliament Ken Livingstone, former leader of the Greater London Council (the forerunner to the new office of an elected mayor) and a public spokesman for the “old” Labour constituencies, succeeded in gaining a place on the Labour shortlist, over Blair’s opposition.

It took two days of battle at Labour headquarters to get

Livingstone through, and then, Blair staged a public fit over the decision of his own party, declaring that he would fight Livingstone’s candidacy “while there is breath left in my body. . . . He has not left behind the extremism he stood for in the early 1980s.”

Under Blair’s direction, “New Labour” has decided to grant the notorious Railtrack the contracts for maintenance of several central London Underground lines. Livingstone opposes this categorically. The policy is highly unpopular in London, and even the London Tories oppose it.

The internal political battle in the Labour Party will go on for months, as the final candidate will not be selected until mid-February. Blair’s favored candidate, Frank Dobson, who gave up his position as Health Secretary to run for mayor, has denied that he is Blair’s “stooge,” and claims he had insisted that Livingstone be allowed on the shortlist. Livingstone is supported by a clear majority of the London Labour Party members, who have one-third of the vote for the candidate, and by many unions, but, to date, the party apparatus is supporting Dobson.

It is typical of Blair’s methods, that he had former Labour Party head Neil Kinnock prepare a political “chargesheet” against Livingstone, accusing him of being a “focus for internal opposition to Blair’s handling of the economy.” Livingstone has spoken out against making the Bank of England independent, “workfare” welfare reforms, austerity, and so

on. Livingstone would “threaten the prosperity of the City of London, the financial center of Europe,” says Kinnock’s chargesheet.

Livingstone is the only “clear winner” in this political battle, as the *Daily Telegraph* truthfully stated in its Nov. 19 editorial, for having “established himself as a poor man’s David defying the Goliath of Downing Street, without having compromised himself.” Livingstone “is the first politician to have turned the tactic that made Tony Blair leader and Prime Minister—running against his own party—against its originator. . . . Tony Blair may prove to be the biggest loser of all. . . . The deeper significance of the Livingstone phenomenon is its impact on the Prime Minister’s prestige. His machine can function only for as long as it is feared. One of the few figures in the Parliamentary Labour Party who owes nothing to Mr. Blair has thrown down a challenge to his entire project.” Livingstone has challenged the “mystique of Blairite invincibility.”

So fraught is the issue of train privatization in Britain, that there have been indications that Dobson himself may oppose the privatization plans. In addition, to save Blair’s close ally, Transport Minister John Prescott, from political embarrassment, Railtrack may be denied the contract for the London Underground in favor of other bidders, which did occur on Dec. 1. The Underground and Railtrack had been due to announce an agreement the day after the Paddington rail crash, but it was put off, due to the public outcry. Railtrack will be told that it could lose its license if it does not restore the track of its rail lines to their condition before privatization.

### The ‘climate of fear’

The political brawl is not confined to the Labour Party. National elections are not likely until 2001—unless, of course, a monumental crisis intervenes—but already the mud is flying thick and fast, especially as disillusion grows with Blair’s regime.

The opposition Tories, who had ruled Britain 18 years before Blair’s New Labour took over, are now the targets of one scandal after another. Internal sleaze is certainly a factor, but no observer can help noting the *timing* of the revelations against leading Tories.

One spin-off of the London mayoralty imbroglio, is the latest sordid episode in the tale of Jeffrey Archer. Lord Archer, a former Conservative Party deputy chairman under Thatcher and a prolific author of political fiction, resigned as party candidate for Mayor of London, after a 13-year-old scandal suddenly reappeared. Tory leader William Hague, who had called Archer a candidate of “probity and integrity” at the Conservative convention three weeks before, now has egg on his face.

The scandal broke when television producer Ted Francis told the Nov. 21 *Sunday News of the World*, that he had lied in a letter to Archer’s lawyers, written in December 1986, to

give Archer an alibi for a critical evening at issue in a libel case. Archer was then suing the tabloid *Daily Star*, which had published the story that Archer was paying a prostitute, Monica Coghlan, for her services. Francis said he had agreed, not because of Coghlan, but rather because of Archer’s known involvement with yet another woman, his “personal assistant” Andrina Colquhoun.

Francis claims he made his new revelations “out of a sense of public responsibility,” to prevent Archer from becoming mayor of London. Certainly, everyone knew that the Archer scandal was a bomb waiting to go off, but the coincidence is remarkable. Archer now faces a criminal inquiry, and he is under heavy pressure to resign altogether from the Conservative Party, before he is thrown out.

The Tories meanwhile, are left having to find a new candidate for mayor of London.

Just days later, an even more explosive scandal emerged, when Rupert Murdoch’s *Times* published a story on Nov. 24 claiming that the £1 million a year the Tory Party receives from its biggest funder, party treasurer Michael Ashcroft, is “foreign cash,” and, apparently, “in breach of new rules” about overseas funding of political parties.

While Ashcroft is a British citizen, and therefore his donations are not technically “foreign”—as the Tories hastened to point out—he is a murky character. A billionaire “tax exile,” he operates out of Belize and Florida as well as Britain. This past summer, the *Times* reported in a series of articles that Ashcroft’s name appeared in a number of U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration files. Ashcroft is suing the *Times* over the story.

The Tories immediately counterattacked, asserting that the central issue is just how their private bank accounts at the Royal Bank of Scotland were so closely monitored, and by whom. Tory officials are likening the affair to the U.S. Watergate scandal.

Most stark was the language of Conservative chairman Ancram, who issued a statement on Nov. 24 asserting that the Tories’ private accounts had been illegally “hacked into,” and calling on the Metropolitan Police and Data Protection Registrar to investigate.

Ancram said: “It is deeply significant that the private bank accounts of the Conservative Party have been penetrated. This appears to be the latest of a series of dirty tricks being perpetrated by those who will stop at nothing in order to keep this government in power. . . .

“There is a climate of fear being created in Britain today. Dissidents are silenced. Opponents are smeared. Now, private bank accounts are hacked into in order to discredit and destroy anyone who stands in the way of this government’s lust for power.”

The *Times* snootily denounced Ancram’s statement as “incomprehensible” and “bizarre,” but any and all who have watched Blair’s Mussolini-like rule, would endorse them.