

---

## International Responses

---

# Clinton means trade war and mediocrity

**Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamed**, quoted in the *New Straits Times*, Nov. 4:

Prime Minister Mahathir suggests that Clinton attend to human rights and environmental issues in his own country, before exporting his ideas elsewhere. "You cannot preach something you do not practice. We hope there is no attempt to export their ideas and standard to other people," said Mahathir.

In its lead editorial, the newspaper stresses that Clinton has no mandate from the voters. "The prosaic truth is that they came to vote in rejection of the Bush government. The electorate responded, not to Clinton for his ideas, but simply to the idea of change."

**Japanese Foreign Minister Michio Watanabe**, addressing constituents in Tochigi on Nov. 4:

Watanabe warned that the Clinton victory may mean the reactivation of the U.S. "Super 301" trade war legislation, which imposes tariffs of up to 100% on exports of any country that refuses to open its markets sufficiently to U.S. goods. "The Democratic Party has been supporting trade protectionism and attempting to put a brake on the sale of cheaper Japanese goods. It's possible [Clinton as President] would reactivate Bill 301," he said.

**Taiwanese Economics Minister Vincent Siew**, quoted in the *Economic Daily News*, Nov. 4:

"The U.S. will no longer be a completely open market. Priority will be given to U.S. interests. This will affect the global economy."

*Economic Times*, India, editorial, Nov. 5:

The fact that the U.S. is bankrupt means that the U.S. will exercise its muscle in various commercial and political fields. This is not the arrogance of a superpower, "but the cattiness of a declining power wanting to blame everybody else for its decline. . . .

"President Clinton is likely to bring back Super 301 in a far stronger fashion than before, and perhaps Special 301 also. He is more likely to cut back than expand U.S. aid and U.S. funding of global agencies. He is likely to add more conditions for the disbursement of funds, including provisions on human rights and defense, that India is likely to find irksome."

*El País*, Spain, "Europe Fears Trade War with U.S.," Nov. 3:

"If Clinton gets to the White House, many experts say, customs wars will break out for certain. The French will be the first with their heads on the chopping block, they will see Washington strike French wines heavily."

**Panama**, report from *EIR*'s sources, Nov. 4:

As soon as Panamanians heard that George Bush had gone down in the polls, they lit up the skies with fireworks and took to the streets with horn-toting motorcades. Since Nov. 3 was the anniversary of Panama's separation from Colombia, a reporter asked several people whether the fireworks display was not in fact to celebrate the founding of the republic. "No, it was to celebrate the fall of Bush, the genocidalist," replied one person. Another said, "People are just happy because Bush the criminal is gone. There is optimism now. The man who put Guillermo Endara into the presidency and kept him there, is done for. There is hope."

*Le Figaro*, France, Nov. 5:

Clinton's victory was "fragile and ambiguous." His triumph has the sense of being a "victory by default. Over the course of months, the pressing desire to rid themselves of George Bush slowly supplanted the profound doubts that a majority of Americans still have about the strength of character of Bill Clinton."

**Antonio Gambino**, senior foreign policy analyst for *Espresso* magazine, in an interview with *L'Unità*, Italy, Nov. 6:

"Clinton resembles Carter more than Kennedy. . . . The same voters who had believed in Reagan, in easy money . . . rely on Clinton's smile. . . . But Carter, when he had to face the economic crisis, was crushed. . . . The Americans want to stay in Europe, want to use NATO as a means, an instrument to control us. Therefore, I do not believe that Clinton will change the old policy."

*Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, Switzerland, Nov. 4:

A Clinton administration would be much more inclined to engage U.S. military forces in regional hotspot conflicts than even the Bush and Reagan administrations were. Clinton's advisory team, typified by his defense advisers Sen. Sam Nunn (D-Ga.) and Rep. Les Aspin (D-Wisc.), belong to what is known as the "limited objectives school," which foresees a reshaping of the U.S. military, in the "post-Cold War world," to deal with "new threats and regional conflicts." They foresee smaller, more flexible forces, of a "conventional reaction" type, using "smart weapons," to be deployed under a "multilateral United Nations" mantle. In their doctrine, targeted military power is vital as an arm of foreign policy, to maintain the "credibility" of that policy. They also insist that the risks and dangers of U.S. involvement are decreased, because it is less likely that regional conflicts would escalate, now that the Soviet Union has disintegrated.