

## Clinton's hairsbreadth chance for survival

by Webster G. Tarpley

During the final third of the Clinton administration's first 100 days in office, four policy divergences have opened between Clinton, on the one hand, and the "general line" of the Anglo-American financial oligarchy, on the other. None of these divergences is a yawning gulf; each is rather a hairsbreadth crack, but capable of widening into something bigger. If these hairline fractures expand, the Clinton administration may survive. If they are papered over, this administration is probably doomed to succumb to the paralysis and collapse that afflict most governments in the world at this juncture.

The points at issue are: 1) U.S. policy toward Bosnia; 2) U.S. pressure on the International Monetary Fund to relax the strict austerity conditionalities which have been imposed on Russia; 3) Clinton's overall promise (taking a leaf from economist Lyndon LaRouche's 1992 campaign economic policy book) to create 8 million jobs, and specifically Clinton's emergency jobs bill; and 4) the Russian proposal which, according to reliable reports, was placed on the table at the Vancouver summit for a joint U.S.-Russian experiment in antiballistic-missile defense using the new physical principles of directed energy weapons. This proposal has the potential to revive the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative as it was originally presented in 1982 by LaRouche.

### **Bosnia arms embargo must be lifted**

The arrogant bravado of the congeries of assassins calling itself "Bosnian Serb Parliament," in rejecting the appeasement offered by the Vance-Owen partition plan, has confronted Clinton with the fact that the United States no longer has even the semblance of a Bosnian policy. The policy of gingerly entering into the logic of Vance-Owen while

reserving the right to disagree on its details announced by Secretary of State Warren Christopher on Feb. 10 is no longer tenable, since the Vance-Owen plan no longer exists. The necessity here is to lift the arms embargo on Bosnia and Croatia, while ending the genocidal sieges of the main Bosnian cities by using NATO air power to destroy the Serbian artillery concentrations, air bases, and logistics bottlenecks inside Bosnia.

According to a leak published in *Newsweek*, during the last week of March, Clinton directed the Pentagon to increase contingency planning for possible U.S. airstrikes against precisely such Serbian positions inside Bosnia. According to the same report, visiting pro-Serbian geopolitician British Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd objected to such U.S. planning in a meeting with Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Colin Powell at the Pentagon. NATO commander Gen. John Shalikashvili has also talked about shifting alliance aircraft to Italian bases where they would be optimally positioned to strike at the Serbs.

On March 30, the Clinton administration formally rejected a demand from Britain, France, and Spain for the U.N. Security Council to vote a formal and unqualified endorsement of the infamous Vance-Owen partition plan. The United States instead used tacit Russian support to obtain the passage of a U.N. Security Council resolution to finally provide enforcement of the no-fly zone against Serbian aircraft which had been in action most recently against the agonizing cities of eastern Bosnia. This was passed with China abstaining, and will begin to be enforced by the NATO command against both helicopters and fixed-wing aircraft on April 15. The United States is also pressing for a naval zone of exclusion

to be established by NATO vessels along the Serbian coast and Danube River.

These measures are in themselves totally inadequate to deal with the slaughter now being wrought on Bosnia, but something is moving. A key issue remains the lifting of the arms embargo against Croatia and Bosnia, the victims of Serbian aggression. Christopher has spoken of sounding out the other powers on how the embargo might be ended, and it is widely assumed that Bosnian President Alija Izetbegovic's signature on the Vance-Owen plan was predicated on U.S. assurances that the embargo would be lifted on Bosnia if the Serbs did not accept the Vance-Owen plan as well. That promise must now be fulfilled.

### **Milosevic's kiss of death**

Clinton's strategists must realize that he will pay an awesome political price for accepting the role of the cringing Neville Chamberlain of Bosnia. Anthony Lewis asks in the *New York Times*, "Is there a limit to the shame President Clinton will feel without acting?" Worst of all for Clinton is that the chief Serbian butcher, Slobodan Milosevic, emboldened by U.S. passivity, has openly mocked the President. "I appreciate very much that the United States will not be the world policeman, to put everything in order in its own view," said Milosevic. "This administration is oriented to the essential problems of the United States and will not try to hide internal problems by opening international problems."

Clinton's response was alarmingly weak: "I've done everything that I know to do consistent with the possibilities we have for further action in the United Nations with our European allies and the members of the Security Council," he told reporters during a meeting with Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak. Clinton said that Milosevic was on a "charm offensive" and was trying to head off tighter economic sanctions. In reality, Milosevic laughs at sanctions.

It is said that Clinton's handlers are very much focused on his chances for reelection in 1996. If so, they should see that his exchange with Milosevic is a political kiss of death. Decisive air attacks on Serbia, with no U.S. ground troops required, must now lead the agenda.

### **The strategic challenge**

On the International Monetary Fund and Russia, Christopher, in his Chicago speech, recognized that the current Russian upheaval represents "the greatest strategic challenge of our time." After that promising beginning, which appeared to dump George Bush's thesis that the collapse of Russia into civil war was in the U.S. national interest, the administration has urged the IMF to relax the draconian and impossible conditionalities which have blocked most economic inputs for Russia. The United States has requested debt rescheduling and other innovations from the mid-April meeting of the Group of Seven (G-7). One senior administration official commented that Clinton wants the IMF to deal "more cre-

atively" with Russia. To expect this from the IMF is absurd, but there may be a growing awareness even in the Treasury Department of the lethal strategic implications for the United States of the IMF's Schachtian conditionality and adjustment programs. If Clinton is to deal successfully with Russia, the IMF conditionalities must be lifted and the IMF itself must be neutralized.

### **Jobs and the economy**

Clinton's overall five-year deficit reduction plan is a disaster, and he can only hope that Congress will be unable to enact his tax increases and budget cuts in their current form. But amidst the austerity gloom, there was a glimmer of light from the White House: acting under pressure from western Democratic senators like Max Baucus of Montana and Ben Campbell of Colorado, Clinton abandoned for the moment his proposed increases in fees for mining, livestock grazing, and timber cutting on public lands. This was a defeat for the environmentalist coterie around Vice President Al Gore and Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt, and a sign of healthy political realism that might permit Clinton to avoid some mistakes and correct some that he has already made.

After the budget resolution, Clinton wanted to secure passage of his "stimulus package," which had been whittled down from his campaign rhetoric to \$16.3 billion in new spending plus \$3.2 billion from the highway and other trust funds. The reduced dimensions of this package make it something of a symbolic issue in today's depression, but Clinton claims that it will create 200,000 temporary jobs while providing some repairs for highway and airport infrastructure. It should be passed. Clinton wants \$4 billion for extended unemployment benefits, money for the Women Infants and Children (WIC) nutritional supplement program, \$300 million for immunizations, and \$1.9 billion for Pell grants for college students. The package, he claims, will provide 50,000 jobs this summer through seasonal Head Start programs for preschoolers, and 89,000 jobs in inner-city schools during the summer and fall. Cities would receive \$2.5 billion in community development grants.

This package had no trouble in clearing the House, but by April 1 it was clear that Senate Minority Leader Bob Dole's Senate Republicans were organized to filibuster against Clinton's measure. The Republican argument was that Clinton's jobs bill would only add to the deficit. Republican speeches on this issue tended to be pure Ross Perot, and it is well known that Dole has been palsy with the diminutive deficit demagogue. Perot had taken the point for the beaten GOP by assailing Clinton because "his plan won't work. His plan is going to drastically increase spending. It is not being candidly presented to the American people. . . . Most of it is based on tentative premises and guesses." Clinton did react to Perot's "rumor mongering" during a trip to Annapolis, but plaintively noted that his own plan was "85% what Ross Perot recommended."

## The rich man's club

In a recent interview with Jay Leno, former Chrysler boss Lee Iacocca revealed the existence of a rich man's club composed of himself, the late Sam Walton of Wal-Mart, Perot, and Warren Buffett of Berkshire Hathaway. These men assembled with the idea that one of their number should run for President with the support of the others, Iacocca recounted. Eventually, Perot emerged as the candidate, but he preferred not to stress the existence of the group during his campaign. Those interested in knowing more about Buffett are referred to the fascinating 1992 book entitled *The Franklin Cover-Up: Child Abuse, Satanism, and Murder in Nebraska*, by John W. DeCamp.

Clinton's strategy for getting his jobs bill through the Senate relied on the byzantine parliamentary tricks of Sen. Robert Byrd (D-W.Va.). These succeeded only in antagonizing most of the Republicans, giving them increased cohesion. The Republicans, with Perot in their corner, felt they had a winning political hand. Democratic Sen. Richard Shelby of Alabama, who had placed the death penalty on the District of Columbia ballot last November, voted with the Republicans, causing Clinton to withdraw all patronage from his state. Three times the Democrats attempted to invoke cloture and cut off the filibuster, and three times they fell short of the 60 votes required. On April 7, the White House, unable to obtain a face-saving compromise, announced a truce that would last two weeks, until the end of the congressional Easter recess.

Big city mayors of both parties are lobbying hard for Clinton's bill, and they are joined by large parts of organized labor, especially the construction trades. While the Republican senators like Alfonse D'Amato (N.Y.), Arlen Specter (Pa.), Mark Hatfield (Oreg.), and James Jeffords (Vt.) are in their districts, they will be pressed to change their votes. Sen. David Durenberger (Minn.), who has just been indicted, and Robert Packwood (Oreg.), barraged with sex harassment charges, would normally be prospective GOP defectors, but they are fighting for their own survival.

The Republican position is simply that they do not care about jobs, only their deficit fetish. Clinton would be improved by a victory. But if he wants to win he will have to stay in the White House, focus public attention on the issue, and appeal directly to the population over the heads of Congress and the bond market in the way that Franklin Roosevelt and even Ronald Reagan sometimes knew how to do.

The key to unmasking the deficit demagogues is LaRouche's proposal for a one-tenth of 1% tax on derivative securities, levied on the total value of the assets being pledged at the moment of the transaction. This tax would be paid by the seller. It is estimated that this single measure would just about wipe out the deficit by itself, bringing in about \$1 billion per day in additional revenue. If the Republicans are serious about deficit reduction, they must embrace the derivative securities tax.

# Trilaterals promote one-world government

by Scott Thompson

The Trilateral Commission held its annual plenary meeting at the Park Hyatt Hotel in Washington, D.C. March 27-29, under the three-way chairmanship of Paul Volcker for North America, Otto Count von Lambsdorff for Europe, and Akio Morita for Japan. The gathering kept up the infamous tradition of past chairmen, such as David Rockefeller and Henry Kissinger, in promoting schemes for one-world government and dismantling the sovereign nation-state, under conditions of what Volcker himself has referred to as "controlled disintegration" of the world economy.

Top agenda items included "multilateral peacekeeping" under United Nations auspices, and population control (specifically the prevention of "migration").

## Toward a world army

One of the two main discussion papers at the conference was titled, "Keeping the Peace in the Post-Cold War Era: Strengthening Multilateral Peacekeeping." The chairman of the group that wrote the draft is John Roper, the first director of the Institute for Security Studies of the Western European Union (WEU) in Paris and former member of the British Parliament. The report has all the markings of the Lord Bertrand Russell's scheme to create a "one-world government," by attaching a world army to the United Nations. The only difference is that the Trilateral program takes a step-by-step approach toward this end.

As the report begins: "In 1945 the founding members of the United Nations wanted to make it an effective instrument of collective security. . . . The international community gave the United Nations the authority through the Security Council to identify states guilty of aggression and then take action to force them to withdraw and be punished."

The report is very clear that it wants NATO and the WEU to act as regional arms of the U.N. for Europe, while it suggests that the United States should carry out a similar role, along with Japan, in Asia.

There was close collaboration between the Trilateral Commission and the United Nations in this effort. The chief commentator on the panel where the report was discussed was Marrack Goulding, U.N. Undersecretary General for Political Affairs and former Undersecretary General for Peacekeeping Operations. The report advocates a plan that goes beyond U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali's call for a standing U.N. military force.