

Clinton snubs Brits, builds new U.S.-Russia alliance

by Edward Spannaus

The men in the State Department . . . should be working for Winston [Churchill]. As a matter of fact, a lot of the time, they *are*. Stop to think of 'em: Any number of 'em are convinced that the way for America to conduct its foreign policy is to find out what the British are doing, and then copy that.

That was Franklin D. Roosevelt speaking in 1943, as recounted by his son Elliott. It is clear from Elliott's account in his 1945 book *As He Saw It*, that FDR was gravely concerned about the possibility of Britain driving a wedge between the United States and Russia in the postwar period, and using their agents in the United States to do it. Roosevelt was also pleased that U.S. foreign policy was no longer "simply tailing" after Britain's.

Fifty years later, during President Clinton's just-concluded visit to Moscow, it was not the State Department which presented the problem of "tailing" after British policy, but certain Republicans—such as Sens. Robert Dole (R-Kan.), Jesse Helms (R-N.C.), and Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.)—who are denouncing the just-concluded Moscow summit as a "failure," and attacking President Clinton for not provoking a new confrontation with Russia.

Now, there is only one standpoint from which the summit could possibly be denounced as a failure, and that is the standpoint of London. That is precisely what Henry Kissinger did in the May 12 *Washington Post*, where he blasted Clinton for his "solicitude" toward Yeltsin, compared to his "tone deafness exhibited toward western European—and especially British—concerns." Kissinger complained: "If any European city deserved to be singled out by America for an Allied remembrance, it was London."

Kissinger and London's fury goes back earlier, of course. It was most notable around Clinton's visit to Germany last

July, when he dumped the Anglo-American "special relationship" and established a new partnership with Germany, oriented toward the development of eastern Europe and Russia.

The President's trip to Moscow, in which he emphasized the importance of a direct U.S.-Russian alliance (without any interference or mediation by Britain), was a direct continuation of what he began last year in Germany. "Just as Russians and Americans fought together 50 years ago against a common evil, so today we must fight for the common good," Clinton declared at the V-E Day commemoration in Moscow. "We must work for an end to the awful savagery of war and the senseless violence of terrorism. We must work for the creation of a united, prosperous Europe. We must work for the freedom of all of our people to live up to their God-given potential. These are our most sacred tasks and our most solemn obligations."

By all accounts, Clinton was deeply moved by the parade of World War II veterans in Moscow. In paying tribute to the 27 million Soviet citizens who had died in the war, he noted that the Cold War had "obscured our ability to fully appreciate what your people had suffered, and how your extraordinary courage helped to hasten the victory we all celebrate today." After the victory, "the dream of peace soon gave way to the reality of the Cold War," Clinton continued, but we have the opportunity and the obligation "to rededicate ourselves today to the promise of that moment 50 years ago when Europe's guns fell silent."

Triple Entente set back

In contrast to those denouncing Clinton over the Moscow summit, *EIR* founder and contributing editor Lyndon LaRouche praised the President's handling of the summit as "a rather spectacular job in diplomacy." In an interview on May 11, LaRouche elaborated: "There's nothing particularly

spectacular in any *detail* of what he did, but the way he handled the situation, I'd say, was really of a sterling quality, and I don't mean British sterling."

LaRouche pointed out that the British, with their usual "British perfidiousness," are trying to get a quarrel going between the Russians and the United States. What they are doing, he commented, is "trying to take the number-two power and play it against the number-one. And their so-called revival of a Triple Entente policy, of Britain and France and Russia lined up against the United States, which they're very open about, took a real setback."

As with most of the foreign policy initiatives which Clinton has taken against the British and Kissinger, the typical American who relies on the U.S. news media would know almost nothing about it. In Moscow, the President delivered a little-publicized speech at Moscow State University which in some respects recalled Lincoln's U.S.-Russian alliance against Britain during the U.S. Civil War, and other periods of direct collaboration between the United States and Russia.

Clinton opened this speech with a reference to the Russian scientist Mikhail Lomonosov (1711-65), noting Lomonosov's modernization of the Russian language two centuries ago. In fact, Lomonosov not only modernized the Russian language through his poetic and scientific writings, but was also one of the founders of the scientific tradition in Russia which led to the work of the great Vladimir Vernadsky. He was also in contact with the German, French, and American scientific community, including Benjamin Franklin.

The President also sought to enlist Russia in the struggle against what he called "the forces of organized destruction" (see *Documentation*). "We must work together to defeat these new security threats," Clinton urged, "and this world needs a strong and democratic Russia to meet these challenges."

LaRouche took particular note of Clinton's description of the common enemy in this speech. As LaRouche put it: "He identified the great danger coming not from one nation-state attacking another, but powerful forces which penetrate the borders of many nation-states, including the United States, a direct reference to another situation which the President has handled rather well, the Oklahoma City terrorist bombing, which was set up by, and set into motion as a terrorist operation by British people like Lord [William] Rees-Mogg."

LaRouche added that Clinton "was diplomatic, and did not mention *London*; but I'm certain that the President knows the British monarchy is the party that is responsible for this and other present, recent past, and possibly future events of a similar gory quality."

The economic obstacle

The biggest obstacle in reestablishing a fruitful U.S.-Russian alliance is the damage which western-imposed "shock therapy" and International Monetary Fund conditionalities have wreaked against the Russian economy. *EIR* has repeatedly warned that the economic devastation caused by IMF "free market reforms" is creating a dangerous backlash

against the West and against the United States in particular.

President Clinton heard this first-hand during his meeting with ten Russian opposition leaders on May 11. White House press secretary Mike McCurry told reporters after the meeting that the politicians had extensively discussed economic conditions in Russia. He said that former economic chief Yegor Gaidar told Clinton that "there were negative attitudes toward the United States in large parts of the Russian population." McCurry's description was that "there was a sense that the West and the United States do not care about the hardship Russians face . . . that we do not understand the nature of their sacrifice." McCurry recounted that former Foreign Trade Minister Sergei Glazyev, a prominent opposition parliamentarian, said that Russia is facing economic problems similar to those the United States suffered in the 1930s Depression. McCurry added that Clinton had found the whole discussion "enormously profitable."

In his Moscow State University speech the night before, President Clinton acknowledged some of the limitations of "free market" reforms: that they must be tempered with policies that ensure fairness and basic human decency. "Economic reform must not be an excuse for the privileged and the strong to prey upon the weak."

Documentation

The following are excerpts from President Bill Clinton's remarks at Moscow State University on May 10, as transcribed by Federal News Service.

I can think of no better place than a great seat of learning like Moscow State University to speak about the past and future of Russia. In this spirit, Mikhail Lomonosov lives on, for just as he modernized your ancient language for the Russian people two centuries ago, today you must take the lead in shaping a new language, a language of democracy that will help all Russia to chart a new course for your ancient land. . . .

Yesterday, all of Russia and much of the entire world paused to remember the end of World War II and the terrible, almost unimaginable price the peoples of the Soviet Union paid for survival and for victory. Because our alliance with you was shattered at the war's end by the onset of the Cold War, Americans never fully appreciated, until yesterday, the true extent of your sacrifice and its contribution to our common victory. And the Russian people were denied the full promise of that victory in World War II, a victory that bought the West five decades of freedom and prosperity. . . .

Your decision for democracy and cooperation has given us the opportunity to work together to fulfill the promise of our common victory over the forces of fascism 50 years ago. . . .

Your progress on the economic front is also important.

. . . I know there are severe problems in your transition to a market economy. I know, too, that anywhere free markets exist, they do not solve all social problems. They require policies that can ensure economic fairness and basic human decency to those who need and deserve help. . . .

To too many people in this country, I know that economic reform has come to mean hardship, uncertainty, crime, and corruption. Profitable enterprises once owned by the state have been moved into private hands, sometimes under allegedly questionable circumstances. The demands of extortionists have stopped some would-be entrepreneurs from even going into business. And when the heavy hand of totalitarianism was lifted from your society, many structures necessary for a free market to take shape were not there, and organized crime was able to move into the vacuum.

These are real and urgent concerns. They demand an all-out battle to create a market based on law, not lawlessness, a market that rewards merit, not malice. Economic reform must not be an excuse for the privileged and the strong to prey upon the weak. . . .

In the 21st century, we will face new and different security threats. In the 21st century, I predict to you there will be no world war to write about between nations fighting over territory. I predict to you that there will not be a new great colossus killing tens of millions of its own citizens to maintain control. I believe the battles of the 21st century will be against the organized forces of destruction that can cross national lines or threaten us from within our borders. We see these forces in the bombing of the World Trade Center, in the terrible tragedy in Oklahoma City in the United States. We see it in the bombings on the streets in Israel designed to kill the peace process in the Middle East. We see it in that terrible gas attack in the Tokyo subway. We see it in the problems that you and so many other nations have with organized crime. . . . We must work together to defeat these new security threats, for in this new century the world wants and needs strong democratic countries where people are truly free and secure. And this world needs a strong and democratic Russia to help meet these challenges. It is in that context that I have pledged to President Yeltsin we will continue to work on all the issues between us. . . . We have already witnessed what Russia can do on the world's stage when it is completely engaged and committed to democracy. From the Near East to as far away as El Salvador, America and the world have been made more secure by Russian leadership and cooperation. As Russia takes her rightful place, we believe that the trends toward democracy and economic freedom and tolerance must and will continue.

I know there are some in this country who do not favor this course. And believe me, there are some people in my country who do not believe that you will follow this course. They predict that instead you will repeat the patterns of the past. Well, of course the outcome is not assured; nothing in human affairs is certain. But I believe those negative voices are mistaken. . . .

Domenici plan draws battle lines on Medicare and Medicaid

by Mel and Kathleen Klenetsky

House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.) and Sen. Phil Gramm (R-Tex.) promised America a balanced budget amendment in their first 100 days in office. While the Gingrichites succeeded in passing their balanced budget amendment in the House, they failed in the Senate by one vote. The Senate and House Budget Committee proposals released in the second week in May are the latest Republican efforts to fulfill their goal of balancing the budget by the year 2002. Because they failed to achieve a balanced budget amendment, which would have mandated the federal government to balance the budget, they are now trying to legislatively cut the budget—by almost \$1 trillion on the Senate side and \$1.4 trillion on the House side, over the next seven years—in a fruitless attempt to balance it.

This “hellfire” approach is spearheaded by almost a half-trillion dollars in proposed cuts in Medicare and Medicaid. Should these cuts go through, millions of elderly will be added to the poverty rolls. Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala, at a press conference called to address the House and Senate budget proposals, said, “First let me say that Medicare cuts will make elderly and disabled Americans poorer. . . . Three-fourths of the people who are on Medicare today . . . have incomes under \$25,000 a year. We’re not talking about rich people. . . . By the year 2000, if these cuts go through and if they’re split between the providers and the beneficiaries . . . the elderly and the disabled, those people who make under \$25,000 a year, in the year 2000 would pay almost \$1,000 more for their health care. That would make them poor.”

Sen. Pete Domenici (R-N.M.), chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, announced his plan on May 9, to cut the federal budget by \$961 billion over the next seven years. Domenici’s budget calls for \$255 billion in savings from Medicare and \$175 billion in savings from Medicaid, which means that he plans to balance the budget with almost 50% of his proposed cuts coming from plans that service the elderly and the disabled. Medicare is entirely for the elderly, and almost two-thirds of Medicaid expenditures go to the elderly and the disabled.

“The budget that we put before you presents hard choices and I make no apologies for that,” Domenici said. “The American people, by overwhelming majorities, 80% of