
LaRouche on Somalia, Haiti

Clinton has no policy, just 'globaloney'

In an interview on Oct. 14 on the weekly "EIR Talks" radio show hosted by Mel Klenetsky, Lyndon LaRouche was asked to comment on the troubles the Clinton administration is encountering in Somalia and Haiti. Excerpts from his response follow.

The Clinton administration has surrendered, essentially, to [Secretary General Boutros] Boutros-Ghali's U.N. Security Council. And in both the cases of Somalia and Haiti, the United States is following a policy which is a one-world dogma centered in certain circles around the U.N., the people who believe in one world, who believe in what is better called globaloney. . . .

That is the continuation of the Project Democracy or Bush "neo-conservative" policy, which says that the only issues of foreign policy and strategic doctrine for the United States, now that the Soviet empire has collapsed and we are the only superpower, are to impose radical democracy, as we define it from moment to moment, and radical free trade upon the entire world, and that we will use military force to adjust the process of bringing what we call democracy and free trade to every country, to crush the opposition to these policies within those countries. So it's really globaloney again.

We now have "imposed democracy" on Russia. Yeltsin has suppressed democratically elected institutions, virtually. . . . We now call that "democracy." Democracy, we find, is whatever submits to the pleasure of such as Citibank and the Federal Reserve District of Manhattan.

If you believe that Project Democracy or the neo-con utopians, with their ideas of democracy and free trade, are reality, then you are going to tend to deny the existence of any reality which says that your policy is a bunch of meaningless tomfoolery. That's what we have in Somalia. We're upholding a Boutros-Ghali globaloney policy. We end up attacking someone because Boutros-Ghali doesn't like him: General Aideed, whom we helped to bring to power.

We succeeded in overthrowing Siad Barre, the former President of Somalia, by pitting against him a bunch of political parties—each of which was based in some tribalist or similar regionalist association, not national parties—just as Henry Kissinger, back in the 1970s, succeeded in starting a war between Somalia and Ethiopia as part of this project.

So now we decide we don't like General Aideed. So we cook up a pretext; we say we're going to hunt him down and

get rid of him. Now we start killing a lot of Somalis under Boutros-Ghali's ingenious direction. U.S. troops, under U.N. command, go in to shoot people; people get tired of being shot, so they set up a trap. The attack continues, and the U.N. forces fall into an elementary military trap. That is, you start shooting knowing somebody's coming. They send more; you're ready for them, you ambush them. They send in air support; you ambush that. And you have, in addition to hundreds of Somali dead, a few score of U.S. dead and prisoners.

We have people in the Congress who are aware that this has somehow gone way awry, who say, let's get out of there. Not because they have any policy for the area as such; they don't. But they say we have no policy, and we should not be using military force in an area where it seems the U.N. command has gone crazy.

In the case of Haiti, the same thing. There is a commitment to support a very unpopular former President of Haiti, Jean-Bertrand Aristide, who killed a lot of people and was thrown out of the country because of his own terroristic, brutal crimes against humanity. But we were determined, because he was our puppet, to stick him back in there, against the will of the Haitian people. . . .

People don't understand the issues, they don't know what the policy ought to be toward Haiti, but they see another massive bloodbath. And they're sick of it, because the United States has no credible policy for Haiti. . . .

The problem is, we don't have a *global* policy. Because we are still supporting the Sachs shock therapy and IMF conditionalities upon Russia, which have turned Russia, which was open to us, into a military-imperial dictatorship, a thermonuclear power which is beginning, as Georgi Arbatov warned, to hate us bitterly because of what we've done in this connection. We are collapsing the United States; we are about to turn the U.S. dollar into an international rag over which the United States has no control. We're destroying the economies of Europe and North America and other parts of the world. *We have no policy in Washington.*

It's not a matter of the Clinton administration fixing up a few things. The only possibility for the administration to get out of this mess is to take my 1992 election campaign book [*The LaRouche-Bevel Program to Save the Nation*], and some of the other policies which my friends and I have been working on for some years, and say, "Okay, we don't have a policy; here is a policy." The policies left over from the Bush administration and the neo-cons of Project Democracy are a disaster; globaloney is a disaster. Let's go back to the good old American ways of basing a nation on investment in education for scientific and technological progress. Let's open the doors for employment and participation of other kinds, by all persons, of whatever skin color and background, in scientific and technological progress, and the benefits it brings. If we do that domestically, which means big-credit policies for expansion, and if we project the same policy on our foreign policy, we can come out of this mess.