Editorial

The biggest U.S.-British rift since Suez?

We've been saying it for years, but now there's no excuse for anyone in government, or elsewhere, to deny the reality: The British government is in a head-on collision with the Clinton administration. The British-U.S. rift is now totally out in the open, and the outcome of this war will affect the lives of all of us for centuries to come.

We can't trace here the entire five-year history of British assaults against President Clinton, ranging from the Whitewater scandals, to the hysterical British reaction to Clinton's seeking a partnership with Germany, to the intense policy-battle over Bosnia and Russia. Over the last month, however, the conflict has reached a fever-pitch.

The British oligarchy, as Lyndon LaRouche has emphasized, is determined to preserve its power, and it has chosen the Balkan war as one of its tools for doing so. This is Britain's war, but Britain can't make it work without the United States. The problem with President Clinton, as the British press says openly, is that he wants to reach a lasting peace, in collaboration with Russia and China. This objective is anathema to the British imperial design.

Since the NATO summit on April 24, the rift has been fully public, thanks in no small measure to *EIR*. Before that event, Prime Minister Tony Blair came to Washington to attempt to "stiffen the resolve" of President Clinton to commit ground troops to Kosovo. Compliantly, the U.S. press portrayed U.S. and British positions as the same. But *EIR*'s questions at the summit, and coverage of the reality, blew this cover story apart.

From that time forward, the British media have been going bonkers against President Clinton, with one paper going so far as to say that Tony Blair should be the U.S. President, not Bill Clinton. The *Sunday Times* of May 3 cited a nominal American, James Hooper, executive-director of the Balkan Action Council, and a strong supporter of mounting a ground war in Yugoslavia, to make their point: "How can we get the leadership it will take to turn the air campaign into a winning ground war? The simplest way is to revoke the Declaration of Independence, and reunite with Britain to avail ourselves of Tony Blair's firm and principled leadership."

Both the London *Times* and the *Daily Telegraph* have been rabid, with editorial after editorial attacking President Clinton for his every effort to resolve the conflict. He's been attacked for involving the Russians, for proposing a Balkan reconstruction plan at the end of the war, for seeking to reestablish relations with the Chinese after NATO's criminal bombing of its embassy.

On May 13, the *Daily Telegraph* virtually howled with pain over Blair's failure to corral President Clinton into a ground war, a move they know will kill any diplomatic potential with China or Russia. Calling Clinton the "chief ditherer," the editorial bemoans his unwillingness to escalate. It then notes: "Things have got so bad in the alliance that there are now mutterings that the normally first-class sharing of military and strategic information between Britain and the United States is being impaired." (Good!)

On May 17, the London *Times* lead editorial was even more shrill. Citing Winston Churchill's call for "a special relationship between the British Commonwealth and Empire and the United States," the paper praised the "political intimacy" which continues to this day, shown by the joint article by U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and British Foreign Secretary Robin Cook in the *Washington Post*, but expressed great concern about the fact that President Clinton is "reluctant" to go along.

That "reluctance," and the conflict over whether to negotiate or escalate the war, has hit the front pages ever since.

Back in 1956, President Eisenhower had the guts to counter the British-French-Israeli attack on Egypt's Suez Canal, showing that U.S. "brawn" need not be controlled by British "brains." Unfortunately, that rift was patched up, over the dead body of President Kennedy. Today, the potential for putting the British oligarchical relics in their place, through an alliance among the sovereign nation-states of the United States, Russia, China, Germany, and others, is again on the agenda. It can only happen if nations and citizens have the guts to tell the truth: The British oligarchy is the enemy, and it must be destroyed.

72 Editorial EIR May 28, 1999