

Globalists push Clinton into North Korea confrontation

by Edward Spannaus

The foreign policy priorities set by the Anglo-American establishment powers behind the Clinton administration, are propelling President Clinton into a series of crises which portend strategic and economic disaster. The most dangerous situation is the drive to provoke a crisis around North Korea; but the President's "free trade" agenda is also setting him up for a mighty fall around the issue of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA).

In both cases, the President is being warned that the "credibility" of his administration is at stake. Regarding North Korea, the issue is posed as the credibility of the announced nuclear non-proliferation policies; around NAFTA, the President is being cautioned that the "moral authority" of the United States and his own image will be severely tarnished if he cannot get NAFTA through the U.S. Congress.

By following an agenda designed by globalist utopians who profess that "free trade," "democracy," and control over technology are the mainstays of U.S. policy, Clinton is careening from crisis to crisis, and will rapidly find his administration destroyed by the attempt to pursue such illusory objectives.

Russia: the biggest crisis

The biggest crisis for the administration, as Lyndon LaRouche has repeatedly warned, is Russia; yet the administration continues in its delusions that Boris Yeltsin is taking Russia down the road to "democracy." On the contrary, the new military doctrine disclosed during the first week of November shows that Yeltsin is in fact a captive of the Russian military. If the military rules by default, without a new leadership for the Russian intelligentsia, we will be faced with what LaRouche calls "a Third Rome Russian military dictatorship"—which he describes as "an imperial Third Rome, as the current military doctrine specifies in some great detail, taking over control of former Soviet territory, and also prohibiting—and that's very explicit—NATO or other western institutions from taking over through treaty organizations Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, and so forth."

"The great opportunity of 1989 for building peace," LaRouche said, "has been shot largely by the work of George

Bush and Margaret Thatcher, their policies; and by the shock therapy/IMF [International Monetary Fund] policies. So that is the greatest crisis of the Clinton administration."

Christopher's six priorities

While disaster stalks U.S. policy not only in Russia, but also in Bosnia, Somalia, and Haiti—to cite only the most obvious—Secretary of State Warren Christopher went before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Nov. 4 to present what was billed as a major policy statement on the six foreign policy goals of the Clinton administration. His six fantasy-land priorities are:

1) Economic security, which Christopher stated is "at the heart of our foreign policy." Christopher highlighted three events, all occurring within the next 40 days, which "will help determine the strength of our economy and the standard of living for our people as we enter the 21st century." These are the vote on NAFTA, the decision on the Uruguay Round in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), and the Asian Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) meeting in Seattle.

2) Support for reform in Russia and the newly independent states. "We're placing special emphasis on our support for political and economic reform in Russia, in Ukraine, in the other states of the former Soviet Union and the new democracies of central and eastern Europe."

3) Europe and NATO, where the United States is proposing to transform NATO's relationship with the new democracies of the East. To that end, said Christopher, we have proposed a partnership for peace open to all members of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council as well as others.

4) Asia and the Pacific, a region "which contains the world's most dynamic economies, and it is the most lucrative terrain for American exports and jobs. It is thus most crucial to the President's domestic agenda."

5) The Middle East, where the Israeli/Palestinian accord must demonstrate to all other parties that negotiations work and that extremists cannot stop the march toward peace.

6) Non-proliferation, because "the proliferation of nuclear weapons is the most serious security threat in the post-Cold War era." Christopher described the regions where there are

real risks of proliferation as the Middle East, the Korean peninsula, the Persian Gulf, South Asia, Russia, and the newly independent states.

Obviously not having mentioned Bosnia, Somalia, or Haiti in his list of priorities, Christopher referred to the "set-backs" which could occur in trying to resolve regional conflicts, and appeared to blame television for highlighting those areas. "Television is a wonderful phenomenon, and sometimes even an instrument of freedom. But television images cannot be the north star of U.S. foreign policy," he said.

Heating a hot-spot

While Christopher was speaking, his last point was being especially emphasized by fast-moving developments. That morning, neo-conservative spokesman Charles Krauthammer published a commentary in the *Washington Post* entitled "North Korea's Coming Bomb," which screamed that the impending nuclearization of North Korea is "the single most dangerous problem in the world." Citing the precedent of the Persian Gulf war, Krauthammer called for Clinton to take action, including an immediate economic blockade, saying that "if there is one lesson to be learned from the Gulf war, it is that a President has to prepare the nation for conflict if he is to expect popular support."

As Krauthammer's ravings were being read in Washington, a high-level U.S. official traveling on the plane carrying U.S. Defense Secretary Les Aspin home from South Korea told reporters that North Korea had massed 70% of its military force near South Korea and might "launch a desperate conventional attack on the South."

"The North Koreans have continued to increase their production of [military] equipment," said the official. "They are more forward deployed and I think we may be entering a kind of a danger zone here."

During his "Meet the Press" interview on Nov. 7, President Clinton picked up the theme, warning that North Korea cannot be allowed to build a nuclear bomb and that any invasion by North Korea of South Korea would be considered an attack on the United States.

"North Korea cannot be allowed to develop a nuclear bomb. We have to be very firm about it," Clinton said. Asked whether the United States would be willing to stage a preemptive strike to prevent that, he replied, "I don't think I should discuss any specific options today."

In the days following Clinton's comments, the war-mongering continued from the likes of the Rand Corp.'s strategy director Zalmay Khalilzad, who called for the United States to increase its military capability in the region, and even proposed "surgical air strikes" to take out North Korean nuclear facilities.

The cost could be war

However, some in the U.S. military were taking a more sober approach. On Nov. 7, the *New York Times* reported

that the South Koreans are endeavoring "to impress upon the United States how high a price they might pay if it forced [Kim Il] Sung's desperate, often irrational-sounding government into a corner." By the time Secretary Aspin and his aides left Seoul, the *Times* noted, they "were openly talking about their growing worries that the wrong kind of pressure on the isolated North Korean government could provoke it to lash out."

The impulse behind the building confrontation was dramatized by U.S. officials cited by the *New York Times* who noted that if the United States and its Asian allies don't impose sanctions on North Korea over the nuclear inspection issue, this failure "would totally undercut the Clinton administration's repeated policy that 'counter-proliferation' is a new mainstay of Washington's post-Cold War foreign policy."

The utopian nature of such concerns was highlighted by the U.S. commander on the ground in South Korea. "It is easy in Washington to regard this as just a chess game," he said. "I keep reminding people that this is for real, and it's real scary."

Rep. Dave McCurdy (D-Okla.), arguing against such "nuclear brinksmanship" in a *Washington Post* commentary, concluded: "In Somalia, the price of failure is 29 American lives; in Korea, that price could be war."

NAFTA disaster

The same sort of "credibility" arguments are being used to induce President Clinton to make the approval of NAFTA the be-all and end-all of his global foreign policy. He has stooped so far as to bring Henry Kissinger into the White House, where Fat Henry declared that this is a "once in a generation" opportunity "to do something defining, something that establishes the structure for decades to come."

As Lyndon LaRouche pointed out on Nov. 10 in an interview with the weekly radio program "EIR Talks," Clinton did not start out as a NAFTA enthusiast, but he was pushed into it by the establishment. "It's a deeply embedded policy in a certain part of the establishment, but it cannot work in any way, and the Clinton administration has been stuck with this thing, and it's got to get out of it somehow or other."

"Everything that the administration is proposing—GATT, NAFTA, health care—threatens to become a disaster on the domestic front and the North American front," LaRouche said, "while U.S. European policy is a disaster; Russian policy is a disaster; China policy is on the verge of becoming a disaster—this conference up in the Northwest, this Asia-Pacific economic cooperation zone, that's an absolute disaster; policies toward Japan are a disaster; and policies toward the Third World are a disaster."

"So there's a disaster on every front facing this administration; not that it caused the problems; in point of fact, it inherited these problems from Margaret Thatcher and George Bush," LaRouche concluded, "but they've got the problems."