

Department list of terrorist organizations.

The unprecedented massacre was calculated to set the stage for a suicide bombing campaign by Hamas and its split-off, Islamic Jihad, over the next year. In fact, it set into motion the “cycle of violence” that has yet to end. The Goldstein attack came at precisely the point when Israeli Prime Minister Rabin and Arafat began the formal implementation of the Oslo agreement which envisioned the establishment of a Palestinian state by 1998. The first Hamas-linked suicide attacks did not start until two months later, in April 1994, when Rabin and Arafat signed the agreement for the establishment of the Palestinian National Authority. The agreement called for the conduct of free elections throughout the territories—which would eventually establish the international legitimacy of the Arafat-led government.

But despite this terror campaign, which lasted for months under a massive crackdown by Arafat’s security forces, the Rabin-Arafat alliance, although seriously weakened, was not broken. This alliance was finally broken with Rabin’s assassination by an Israeli, on Nov. 4, 1995.

The next phase of attacks followed the “targetted assassination” of Hamas bomb-maker Yahya Ayyash on Jan. 5, 1996. Although said to be “revenge attacks,” they were in fact part of Hamas’ campaign to get Benjamin Netanyahu elected Israeli prime minister. This was admitted by Ibrahim Ghawshah, Hamas’ official spokesman resident in Amman, Jordan. He said that it was part of their strategy to influence Israeli public opinion to bring down the entire Oslo process. The election of Netanyahu indeed fulfilled all their hopes, especially after he launched his own provocations, which not only brought about the pre-calculated Hamas response, but also brought the region several times to the brink of war.

This tit-for-tat campaign reached the height of insanity when Netanyahu, under the direction of Sharon, who was a member of his government at the time, launched a Mossad assassination attempt in 1997 against the Jordan-based Hamas official Khalid Mishaal. Not only did the attempt fail, but it led to Israel agreeing to release Hamas spiritual leader Sheikh Yassin from an Israeli jail, where he had been under arrest since 1989. Yassin was allowed to return to Gaza to rally Hamas against the Oslo process in general, and Arafat in particular.

This pattern has continued to this very day. Netanyahu’s downfall in 1999 led to the short-lived government of Ehud Barak, who despite much talking and negotiating, furthered the Oslo process not one iota. By the end of the Summer of 2000, the stage was set for Sharon’s ultimate provocation, his Sept. 28 march on to the Islamic holy site Al-Haram Al-Sharif/Temple Mount.

Since coming to power, Sharon has done everything to ensure the collapse of Arafat and the Palestinian Authority. If successful, it would either bring Hamas to power or lead to political chaos within the territories.

## Blair’s ‘New Empire’ Falls Off The Tracks

by Mark Burdman

Since Sept. 11, British Prime Minister Tony Blair has been operating on the delusion that he is the emperor of the world. Usually, those who think they are the reincarnation of Nero, Napoleon, Hitler, or Mussolini, end up in straitjackets, in carefully guarded psychiatric wards. Instead, Blair has spent perhaps one-quarter of his time in trips around the world, visiting some 25 countries. In early January, barely had he returned from his five-day misadventure in South Asia and Afghanistan, than the Prime Minister’s Office at 10 Downing Street announced that he would be visiting several countries in Africa in February, and then, in March, would be attending the Commonwealth summit in Brisbane, Australia, and the European leaders’ summit in Barcelona, Spain.

Why is Blair so desperate to hop around the globe? One strong motivation, is to implement a policy that his foreign-policy guru, Robert Cooper, has defined as the “New Empire,” or “New Imperialism.” At year’s end, the drumbeat for this intensified, in the Blair advisory circles.

But there is a second motivation. As more and more British commentators have asserted since Jan. 1, Blair obviously has an intense desire to avoid the “home front,” where a wave of protests and strikes is building, against the collapse of rail and related infrastructure. This is shaping up as Blair’s nemesis, and he could hardly solve it, by ordering the bombing of British cities, or sending in peacekeeping troops, as per Afghanistan, Kosovo, or Sierra Leone.

### ‘A New Age Of Empire’

Blair spent the first several days of 2002 in Bangladesh, India, and Pakistan. In Bangladesh, the first stopover, he was reportedly working out the modalities for that terribly impoverished nation to provide the leading Muslim contingent for the Afghanistan peacekeeping forces, the which will be under British command for the first three months of this year.

In India and Pakistan, nations with nuclear weapons which are on the brink of war for the first time since 1971, Blair, whose country was the imperial master of the Indian Subcontinent for over two centuries, tried to play down his role as a mediator over the hotly contested Kashmir issue, denied that he was nostalgic for the old days of empire, and claimed that he was intensively coordinating his activities

with U.S. President George W. Bush. However, all of this should be taken with several large grains of salt. When he told an audience of Indian businessmen that Britain would be a “pivotal” power in the world, because of its interconnections with the Commonwealth, European Union, the United States, and the United Nations, he was clearly enunciating the Cooper policy.

As *EIR* reported on Nov. 9, 2001, Cooper, who is the official foreign policy adviser at 10 Downing Street, wrote an article in the October edition of the British liberal establishment monthly *Prospect*, entitled, “The Next Empire,” in which he exclaimed that “the history of the world is the history of empire. . . . All the conditions seem to be there, for a new imperialism.” Cooper happily proclaimed the era of nation-states to be at an end, and pointed to “globalization,” and the policies of the International Monetary Fund, as exemplary, for what form this modern-day imperialism is taking.

After writing this, Cooper was seconded to the British Foreign Office, to become the government’s special envoy to Afghanistan. His piece provoked a rash of articles in the establishment press, promoting “the new imperialism,” and citing him as its guru.

In December, *Prospect* published comments by John Gray, an influential think-tanker in the Blair circles, who is now at the London School of Economics (LSE). Gray declared that “we are inching our way into a new age of empire, . . . once we have discarded the utopian world of nation-states.” Gray, who formerly portrayed himself as an outspoken critic of Cooper’s beloved “globalization,” has obviously made a complete about-face.

Gray proclaimed himself a co-thinker of Thomas Hobbes, the 17th-Century British imperial philosopher (and favorite of Henry Kissinger), reporting that in Hobbes’ *Leviathan*, he insists that the first necessity of life is “peace,” because man lives in a permanent condition of each against all, in which his life is “solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.” Gray asserted: “Here Hobbes describes the condition of a large part of the human species at the start of the 21st Century. Today, hundreds of millions of people live in failed or failing states. If the basics of effective government are to exist in regions of the world where states have failed,” he advised, “a coalition” of powers will have to be created, that “will have to abandon nation-building in favor of something like the institution of empire.”

Gray’s comments are all the more menacing, since the LSE is, according to informed London sources, the “conceptual command center” of the Blair regime. Together with the Blair-created Foreign Policy Centre think-tank, it is devising the New Empire mythos. LSE’s dean, Anthony Giddens, is the guru behind Blair’s so-called “Third Way” policies.

### ‘Vanity, Detachment, Escapism’

But outside Blair’s circles, his New Empire antics are being greeted with a “thumbs down.” On Jan. 8, Bronwen



*Britain’s Tony Blair is facing a domestic revolt at his failed economic policies.*

Maddox, the Foreign Editor of the London *Times*, had only acerbic comments to make, about Blair’s South Asia trip. She began: “If only the emperor had no new clothes. The local costumes Blair has worn in South Asia are an embarrassment which has advertised the vanity and vacuity of his trip, where both the dress and the diplomacy have been patronizing and naive.” She charged that Blair’s desire to be the world “patron of peace,” coupled with his avoidance of an “intractable home front,” “is the best explanation for the air of wide-eyed detachment from real politics that has stripped the value from an always difficult trip. . . . Blair was chided in India for ‘colonial’ arrogance, but the real charge is escapism. In vocabulary worthy of an encounter group, he sidestepped engagement with the issues.”

As for the emperor’s new clothes: “There is no way politely to overlook the Blair dressing-up box. It tells us more than we want to know about the Blairs’ relationship, that Cherie could talk him into the black Nehru suit he wore for Friday’s state dinner, like some aging rocker who can’t come to terms with black tie. . . . It made Blair seem he was playing at the job. In trying to be in tune, it was patronizing, an attempt to say that ‘we understand you.’ ”

Maddox lambasted Blair for lack of a knowledge of history, including phraseology that effectively dismissed the importance of India’s struggle for independence from the British Empire. She accused him of showing no more competence in such attempted grand diplomacy, than he shows in dealing with the British rail crisis.

## Home Front to Blair: 'You Are Failing'

Other British media outlets were equally nasty. On Jan. 8, Reuters published a dispatch from London, entitled, "Globe-Trotting Blair Flies Into Flak Back Home," and began, "Fresh from the battlegrounds of Afghanistan and a tense standoff in South Asia, British Prime Minister Tony Blair flew into hostile territory Tuesday—the home front."

Reuters featured a devastating commentary, published the evening before, in the *Evening Standard* tabloid, by Prof. Tony Travers, entitled, "Tony, Could You Spare A Minute?" Travers is director of the Greater London research group, at the same London School of Economics where the Giddens-Gray duo operate.

Travers wrote: "Congratulations on your statesmanlike tour of Egypt, India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh. Now is it too much to ask, that you give five minutes' attention to the desperate plight of millions of your own people?"

"Sweeping in from the airport behind the motorcycle out-riders, have you even a smidgen of a clue what life is like for the commuters of this city? Today, as every day, Tube [subway] trains and rail stations will be jammed with bodies; squalor will rule the coaches, and services will be cancelled willy-nilly. . . . Every Prime Minister enjoys launching the SAS [Special Air Services] against international foes, undoing the Taliban and being fêted at the high tables of Washington. But the real test of your premiership will be whether you can save Britain's public services. So far, if you take a look down the platform, you will see why most Londoners think you are failing miserably. . . . Every *Evening Standard* reader knows that London passengers are treated worse than cattle—more like criminals."

Travers attacked Blair for trying to hide behind the neo-liberal economic policies of the Margaret Thatcher-John Major Conservative Party years, by claiming that they, not he, are to blame for today's problems. Travers charged that Blair's Labour Party government has provided less "average investment" in basic rail infrastructure, than did the hapless Major regime of 1990-97.

Travers was supported by the lead *Evening Standard* editorial, "Blame Labour For The Railways," which stated: "Today's cry of anguish by Professor Tony Travers will probably not reach Mr. Tony Blair, on the Indian Subcontinent in pursuit of his ambition to be accounted a world leader. But it will strike a chord with millions of rail commuters. . . . Mr. Blair must take the blame. He has presided over a sharper deterioration in Britain's public transport than any Prime Minister before him."

On Jan. 9, *Guardian* Economics Editor Larry Elliott, one of the more competent economic experts in the U.K., wrote, "Put bluntly, Britain has a railway system that was designed and constructed for the world as it was 150 years ago, not the world as it is now." The system suffers from "the legacy of half a century at least of relentless underfunding. . . . The proportion of GDP spent on public transport

has fallen from 2% to 1% in the past decade—a shameful record."

## 'A Winter Of Discontent'

By the middle of the week of Jan. 7, Britain was truly becoming "hostile territory" for the arrogant Blair.

The week had begun, with hundreds of thousands of commuters in central and southern England stranded, because of a strike by the Rail, Maritime and Transport (RMT) union, against Southwest Trains (SWT), in response to which SWT had cancelled 80% of the normal rail services.

As a result of the insane "rail privatization" policies begun under Major, and stepped up under Blair, Britain's formerly nationalized rail grid has been broken up, into several private regional firms, all managed by the incompetent, privatized Railtrack administration. SWT is the U.K.'s largest commuter operator.

The RMT organized strike actions against rail operators in northern England and Scotland, with potentially further actions in other regions planned.

Blair angrily denounced these strike actions as "totally unacceptable." But any hope he and his advisers may have had, of playing angry commuters against strikers, is backfiring. A coalition of rail passengers' groups was formed on Jan. 8, calling itself the Better Rail Advisory Group. It wants to stage a national one-day rail boycott, on March 1. The *Daily Telegraph* wrote Jan. 8, that this is an attempt to reanimate the sense of political-social-economic activism, that hit Britain with the national fuel protests of Summer 2000, the which practically shut the country down.

On Jan. 9, Peter Hain, the Cabinet minister responsible for Europe, lamented that Britain has "the worst transport system in Europe." Inside the Blair Cabinet, there is further turmoil. Transport Secretary Stephen Byers, already under fire for the collapsed state of transport infrastructure, is facing growing demands to resign, since, while the early-2002 troubles were erupting, he was away on vacation, in India.

On Jan. 9, other "fronts" of social ferment began to open up. Leaders of the postal workers' union announced that they were polling their membership, for probable strike action in February, and it is more than likely, that the entire mail system will close down, for some time, in February. Meanwhile, an informed British observer told *EIR* on Jan. 9, that the discontent over the woeful state of the health system, should not be underestimated. He stressed that the "anger and rage" among frustrated Britons is only exacerbated by Blair's obvious efforts "to avoid the situation," in constantly shuttling around the world.

Indeed, more and more British observers and political insiders, have begun to warn, that the U.K. is now, in earnest, entering a "winter of discontent." And unlike some of his evident forebears, this would-be world emperor can't even make the trains run on time.