

Clinton's strategic doctrine: New Age infantilism

by Kathleen Klenetsky

Over the course of September, the Clinton administration has publicly laid out for the first time what it claims to be its strategic doctrine governing the military, economic, and political role of the United States in the world. Despite all the attendant hype, what the administration has produced, after months of allegedly intense study, is a warmed-over version of the insane—and ultimately losing—strategy of the Bush administration.

Defense Secretary Les Aspin began the evaluation process just before Labor Day, when he unveiled the “Bottom-Up Review,” the results of a months-long study of U.S. military policy. Later in the month, Secretary of State Warren Christopher, followed by U.N. Ambassador Madeleine Albright, National Security Adviser Anthony Lake, and finally the President himself, presented elaborations of the “Clinton Doctrine” in a series of well-publicized speeches.

‘Free trade’ and ‘democracy’

As explained by top Clinton officials, the Clinton Doctrine posits as the central objective of U.S. strategic policy, the expansion of free-trade looting policies and “democracy” (which is Washington lingo for political movements in other countries either instigated or manipulated by Washington as battering rams against nationalist institutions).

Cavalierly dismissing the recent “Third Rome” turn in Russia, the Clinton Doctrine insists that the former Soviet Union can never again pose a direct danger to the United States, claiming that, at worst, it can only pose a regional threat. Clinton's strategic policy asserts that the new dangers to the United States come from nuclear proliferation, Third World dictators (e.g., Saddam Hussein and Somalia's General Aideed), and individuals and nations that do not accept the U.S. definition of “democracy.”

The Clinton Doctrine maintains that foreign aid, diplomacy, economic warfare, and military might are all to be

devoted to the task of dealing with these alleged threats, as well as to forcing through the administration's agenda of promoting economic looting policies, under the lofty banner of free trade and democracy. Indeed, the “Bottom-Up Review” states explicitly that a key new role for the U.S. military will be “democracy building,” on the model of the now thoroughly discredited deployment in Somalia.

Fantasy world

What has escaped the notice of the Clinton administration yuppies, is that the policies of free trade and so-called democracy are precisely what are driving the world deeper into political instability—including the very real possibility of a global nuclear war with Russia.

Words like “democracy” and “market economies” may *sound* like something the United States should defend. But what the Clinton administration (and the Bush bunch earlier) means by these terms is epitomized by such policies as the Jeffrey Sachs and George Soros-run looting of Russia, which has triggered a resurgence of the old imperial—and most definitely anti-republican—tendency there, as well as the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), which will destroy U.S. sovereignty by globalizing the Federal Reserve System and the U.S. dollar (see *Feature*).

Asked to comment on the Clinton Doctrine in a radio interview Sept. 29, presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche characterized it as reflecting “New Age” thinking. “These ideas that Clinton has espoused, the idea that democracy and free trade are strategic goals which are the proper subject of concern to the Defense Department, for our military-strategic policy, *this is absolute childishness*, infantilism. . . . This is like the captain of the *Titanic* headed for the iceberg.”

Scoring the administration for its “extreme naiveté,” LaRouche said that it “appears to many around the world—

and to me—that the United States government presently and the United States intelligence services, to the extent they're visible, are paying no attention to the underlying realities of the ongoing process in the world, but seem persuaded, foolishly, that you can drown two-thirds of the world in bloody, dark-age conflict and live in the other one-third of the world in peaceful serenity . . . paying no attention to the monstrous storms which are bulding up around the world, which will hit the United States very soon."

LaRouche was particularly critical of the Clinton administration's policy toward developments in Russia. Not only is the administration ignoring the imperial resurgence in Russia, but the twin pillars of its Russian policy are actually accelerating that development:

First, playing the personality game, holding up Yeltsin as "our man in Moscow," just as George Bush held up Gorbachov, "is the most dangerous thing you can do, particularly with a former adversary superpower," said LaRouche.

Second, Washington's backing for the "so-called free-market policy, which means IMF [International Monetary Fund] conditionalities, shock therapy, George Soros, etc., this is destroying and is injuring Russia, the people of Russia, and driving them mad," said LaRouche. "*The impetus for violence comes from the very policy which the United States is imposing.*"

"The Clinton administration so far . . . has moved itself in the position of continuing the Bush policy—failing to recognize, or refusing to consider *anything* which defines strategy as based on something other than this so-called globalist democracy/free trade issue, pushing all other considerations to one side," LaRouche emphasized. "They are blinding themselves to the actually determining issue. Democracy and globalism, or free trade, [are] *driving* [Russia] toward an explosion."

From 'containment' to 'enlargement'

The most explicit statements to date of the new Clinton Doctrine have come from National Security Adviser Lake and from the President himself.

Addressing the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies in Washington on Sept. 21, Lake announced that the principal objective of U.S. strategy in the coming period should be the "enlargement" of "market economics" and "democracy."

"Throughout the Cold War, we contained a global threat to the market democracies; now we should seek to enlarge their reach, particularly in places of special significance to us," he said. "*The successor to a doctrine of containment must be a strategy of enlargement—enlargement of the world's free community of market democracies*" (emphasis in original).

In other words, the Clinton campaign for "democracy" and "market economics" equals a blueprint for stymying the development of truly republican political institutions, as well

as for attacking the basis for real economic development by putting the political and military weight of the United States behind the oligarchical economic principles of free trade, speculation, and usury.

Lake outlined a four-point program for implementing this "strategy of enlargement." First, the U.S. must strengthen the "core" democracies—the United States, western Europe, Japan, etc.—by pushing for speedy enactment of NAFTA and its global equivalent, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)—even though these accords will accelerate the economic collapse of the signatories, including the United States itself.

The "second imperative for our strategy," Lake stated, "is to help democracy and markets expand and survive in other places where we have the strongest security concerns." Demonstrating the idiocy of the administration's outlook, Lake cited current U.S. policy toward Russia as a prime example of how Washington intends to pursue this "second imperative."

The third element of the Clinton Doctrine involves "isolating the 'backlash states,' " e.g., Iran and Iraq, "diplomatically, militarily, economically, and technologically." "When the actions of such states directly threaten our people, our forces, or our vital interests," Lake said, "we clearly must be prepared to strike back decisively and unilaterally, as we did when Iraq tried to assassinate former President Bush."

Lake identified the fourth key aspect of the Clinton Doctrine as fostering "humanitarian imperatives." But he defined humanitarian assistance as forcing other countries to accept "sustainable development"—the popular euphemism for zero-growth, pick-and-shovel economics!

President Clinton provided further details of his strategic policy when he spoke to the United Nations General Assembly on Sept. 27.

Taking up the twin themes of "democracy" and "free trade," Clinton argued for speedy approval of GATT and NAFTA, and announced that the United States was initiating a major effort to impose much more stringent controls on the spread of nuclear, chemical, and missile technology—a clear signal that his administration will pursue the murderous Bush policy of "technological apartheid," which, under the guise of controlling the spread of dangerous weapons, prevented developing-sector countries in particular from acquiring advanced technology.

Illustrating what the Clinton Doctrine actually means when it talks about "market economies," the President made a concerted pitch for imposing "sustainable development" and for its companion policy, population control: "We simply must slow the world's explosive growth in population," he declared. "We cannot afford to see the human race double by the middle of the next century. Our nation has at last renewed its commitment to work with the United Nations to expand the availability of the world's family planning education and services."