

How to read the President's lips

by Leo Scanlon

On June 2, upon his return from the NATO summit, President Bush gave a lengthy interview to the *Washington Post* which announced his grand strategy for dealing with the Soviet Union: "Beyond Containment." According to carefully manicured leaks to the press, this strategy was the outcome of a process which reflects the quintessential George Bush—chief executive.

As the PR story goes, the President became frustrated with the *status quo ante* thinking of his top security advisers, rejected their long-awaited strategic review, announced his bold arms and troop reduction plans for Europe, left for the NATO meeting where he bested the opposing team, won the day for his side, and returned, triumphant and magnanimous, to explain the secret of his success to the readers of the *Washington Post*.

Yet patriots the world over have been disgusted by the weak and vacillating reaction of the White House to the bloody events in China, and even his staunchest supporters among the conservative populists have been roused from their post-election lethargy, in reaction to White House plans to bail out the collapsing Soviet economy. The June 2 *Post* interview, if looked at closely, will show that the propitiatory response to Communist butchery in China is not the result of an "intelligence failure" but is cut from the same cloth as Bush's proposals in Europe—the "convergence theory."

What Bush said

"Thoughts are that the Soviet Union might well be in the state of radical change. And as this change asserts itself . . . our doctrine need no longer be containing a militarily aggressive Soviet Union. It means a united Europe. It means a Europe without as many artificial boundaries. It means much more freedom and democracy, not only in the Soviet Union, but in Europe. As those things happen, the role of NATO shifts, our own role shifts, from the main emphasis on deterrence to an emphasis on the economic side of things. . . ."

"But Beyond Containment means a significant shift in the Soviet Union. A lightening up on the control in Eastern Europe and thus, freeing them to move down the democratic path much more. And as those changes happen with reality, our mission will change. We will move to a much more peaceful world. . . . Beyond Containment has as its underpinning, reform. . . ."

Then, when asked if he was talking about a "one world system" for Europe, the President responded, "Well, I talked about a united Europe, and I am not just talking about West-

ern Europe. That's the 'vision thing' people talk about. . . ." (This last remark refers to the way Bush is criticized for using vague, New Age-style terms.)

What Bush meant

Aside from the overt reference to a "united Europe" the tell-tale formulation in the interview is the indication that reform in the Soviet Union will produce more democracy in *Europe*—not Eastern Europe. The President is referencing an idea which has been the staple of geopolitical analysts in the State Department and intelligence community since the 1930s, and is upheld today by CIA circles associated with old intelligence hand Ray Cline, his recent book *Metastrategy*, and an outfit called the Association to Unite the Democracies (AUD).

First propounded by Clarence Streit, in his 1939 book *Union Now*, this school of thought argues that the U.S. and Europe must be federated, under a democratic, supranational government structure, (Streit and his crowd wanted the League of Nations to play the role, NATO is the preferred agency today) in which all the "democracies" are bound by economic and security policy decisions reached in the NATO council. Europe will thus be the equal of the U.S., and therefore "more democratic" than today.

This school brushes off the European movement to establish constitutional republics, as seen in the founding of the United States of America, and substitutes the New Age term "pluralist democracy" as the ideal. This contentless formula allows Streit and his followers, including the President, to believe that Communism is a "precursor to democracy" which can evolve into a form of government equivalent to the West's "pluralist democracies." According to their magazine *The Federator*, Russia has been repelled by the political and economic strife among the European nations since the Renaissance. If Europe (and the U.S.) can be stabilized under a central institution of government, it could then attract the Communists to join the "Concentrically Organized Democratic World."

The outermost edge of the "democratic world" is the IMF and GATT. If the Soviets meet the IMF test, they can be integrated into the OECD Summit process, and when that is completed, they can join the "democracies" in NATO itself. As the President said in his interview, "the role of NATO shifts . . . from a military alliance to a political and economic alliance."

If this succeeds, *The Federator* hopes "The species will be granted a stay of time and a release of energies to tackle together its deepest problems: population, ecology, development, and global integration."

It is not only Bush and Gorbachov who are reading from this sheet of music; the AUD cohort includes Generals Scowcroft and Goodpaster, State Department officials, and a host of academics associated with prestigious, but derivative organizations, such as the Atlantic Council.