

## Stung British counterattack Clinton over policy shift

by Edward Spannaus

While Americans remained ignorant of one of the most important developments in U.S. foreign policy in the postwar period, the British escalated attacks on President Clinton, following his writing-off of the U.S.-British "special relationship" during his visit to Germany.

After Clinton's press conference in Bonn on July 11, where he announced a new, "unique" German-American partnership, and consigned the old U.S.-U.K. special link to the history books, British reactions ranged from shock and outrage, to a "stiff upper lip" (see excerpts, following pages). The special relationship—which has allowed the delapidated British oligarchy to impose its policies of economic looting and destruction around the world after the British Empire expired in World War II—consists basically of yoking American "brawn" to British "brains." Without it, the whole gameplan for a one-world U.N. dictatorship could blow up, and sanity, namely peace based on economic development, would have a chance to succeed.

Predictably, the *Sunday Telegraph* of London launched a new round of scandal-mongering on July 17, with a front-page story accusing Clinton of having used cocaine, and then lobbying to have their new allegations brought up in the congressional hearings on Whitewater. The new round of Hollinger Corp. scandal-mongering against the presidency has been considered "newsworthy," where the President's accomplishments have not.

### U.S. media spike the story

U.S. citizens could learn about the scandals from the U.S. news media, but they were not informed about the events which triggered the latest British reactions.

Consider the following: On July 11, Clinton and Germany's Chancellor Helmut Kohl held a press conference, at which Clinton announced the new "German-American part-

nership." When asked by a reporter what would happen to the old "special relationship" with the U.K., Clinton answered that he couldn't pick between the two, because the history of the two relationships is different. He said that the common partnership with Germany is "unique now, because so many of our challenges are to Germany's east." Clinton declared that the United States and Germany "have a more immediate and tangible concern with these issues even than our other friends in Europe."

While the London *Guardian* blurted that Clinton had "effectively ended" the special relationship with Britain, and reduced it to "a mere sentimental tie with the Mother Country," the *Washington Post*, the biggest paper in the U.S. capital, breathed not a word of these dramatic events. Its coverage was limited to describing Clinton and Kohl's appetites and mutual love for food.

Of the major dailies, only the *New York Times* even mentioned that Clinton had called upon Germany to become the major partner of the United States with respect to Europe, and indicated that unnamed "American officials" regarded Britain and France as unable to play a leadership role in Europe. That "newspaper of record" blacked out the exchange regarding the U.S.-U.K. special relationship.

The next day, July 12, prior to delivering his speech at the Brandenburg Gate, Clinton met with Kohl and outgoing European Commission President Jacques Delors. At a joint press conference, Clinton stated, "I want to particularly applaud President Delors for his 'White Paper' on jobs and growth in the European Union. . . . We talked quite a bit today about how we can further develop our cooperation to generate more jobs and higher incomes."

The White Paper, adopted by the European Union heads of state at their Corfu summit on June 25, involves 11 Europe-wide infrastructure projects, including rail projects virtu-

ally identical to those proposed by LaRouche and the Schiller Institute in their "Paris-Berlin-Vienna Productive Triangle" proposal of 1989-90.

On July 13, there was absolutely no U.S. coverage of Clinton's endorsement of the Delors "White Paper" and Clinton's discussion of generating more jobs and higher incomes. None. Why? Could it have anything to do with the British hatred of Delors's infrastructure proposals?

Just before the Corfu EU summit, Lord William Rees-Mogg, writing in the *Times* of London on June 24, denounced Delors's infrastructure projects as "insane" and warned that they would cause a panic on the financial markets. Better to deal with unemployment by "reducing labor costs and rigidities"—i.e., slashing wages and destroying working conditions. British Prime Minister John Major subsequently vetoed the selection of Belgian Prime Minister Jacques Dehaene to replace Delors, on the grounds that he was too much like Delors, and "represents a tradition of big government."

In the week since Clinton's return from Germany, there was still not a word of coverage on the scuttling of the special relationship with Great Britain, or of Clinton's praise for the Delors Plan. To this writer's knowledge, the *Houston Chronicle* was unique in even alluding to British concerns about the decline of their special relationship with the United States.

### The Brits' Whitewater wars

On the principle, "If you don't like the news, make up your own," back came a new round of scandal-mongering. Hollinger board member Sir Jimmy Goldsmith sputtered that Clinton had demonstrated "his astounding lack of history, which is to be added to his astounding lack of wisdom." The lesson that Britain should learn, Goldsmith said, as Washington and Bonn "clamber into bed," is that Britain is now paying the price for its post-Suez-1956 "servility" to the United States.

A few days later, Hollinger's *Sunday Telegraph* escalated the Clinton scandals again, with a front-page story trumpeting charges that Clinton used illegal drugs in the 1970s and '80s. It described the allegations as having been made in a series of "exclusive interviews" with the *Sunday Telegraph*.

Toward the front of the article, author (and British intelligence stringer) Ambrose Evans Pritchard wrote: "Republican Senator Lauch Faircloth, a member of the Banking Committee that later this month will hold hearings into the Whitewater property deals involving Mr. and Mrs. Clinton, wants to expand the narrow scope of the investigation to cover growing allegations about narcotics trafficking and money-laundering in Arkansas in the 1980s."

But once again, Pritchard has gotten ahead of himself. *EIR* learned from the office of Senator Faircloth, a Republican from North Carolina, that Faircloth is not making any attempt to expand the scope of the upcoming hearings. An aide said that Pritchard had asked the senator if credible evidence were presented that Clinton had used drugs while

in office, what would his reaction be? The aide stated that Faircloth did *not* tell Pritchard, "I favor expanding the hearings," but he only said that *if* credible evidence were presented, then the hearings ought to be expanded.

At this point, said the aide, neither Senator Faircloth nor anyone else even knows when the Senate will take up the Arkansas phase of the Whitewater hearings, since the currently scheduled hearings are limited to areas in which special prosecutor Robert Fiske has completed his investigation. That pertains only to the "Washington phase" of the investigation—White House contacts with regulatory agencies, and the events surrounding the death of White House aide Vincent Foster.

Meanwhile, the London *Economist* ran, in its July 9-15 issue, an article listing mysterious deaths and incidents of violence which have taken place in Arkansas—most of which were first dug up or concocted by Hollinger's Ambrose Evans-Pritchard.

The *Economist* begins by discussing the videotapes being circulated by evangelist Jerry Falwell. The Falwell tape "is crude and sensationalist," declares the *Economist*, and "most people have dismissed it as nonsense." But, continues the City of London weekly: "It is true, nevertheless, that a peculiar pattern of suicides and violence surrounds people connected to the Clintons or their associates," and then the *Economist* is off and running with its detailed listing of seven incidents.

The *Washington Times* reprinted the *Economist* article verbatim in its July 19 issue. On the same day, the editors of the *Wall Street Journal* conducted journalistic contortions to justify rehashing the same list. In a long editorial entitled "The Falwell Tape," the *Journal* editors report on the accusations of murder made in the tape, and suggest that the accusations are "old news" to journalists covering the Arkansas scandals. But "few of us have shared any of this knowledge with readers," the *Journal* editors deadpan, since "we decline in the name of responsibility to print what we've heard."

Then how does the story get circulated? It is left to "less responsible sources" to publish it first. Says the *Journal*, "the British press has a different approach," citing Evans-Pritchard and the London *Economist*. The rest of the editorial is devoted to republishing what the *Economist*—"surely not a sensationalist sheet"—has already printed, listing the allegedly curious deaths in Arkansas.

"Pondering the string of violent coincidences," the *Journal* intones, "we feel some duty to share with readers one factor that colors our thinking about the Arkansas connections. In particular, with drugs does come violence, and also money laundering. And laying aside any thought of presidential involvement [perish the thought!], there is a story here worth our attention and yours." Thus the gutter journalism of Ambrose Evans-Pritchard gets laundered through the so-respectable *Wall Street Journal*—the same *Wall Street Journal* which refused to let its readers in on one of the biggest stories of the decade.

# U.S. anti-British shift aired in European press

*The following quotes are cited verbatim from articles in the English language press, or translated by EIR staff where the original texts are in German or Italian.*

### From Great Britain

● “The Clinton Doctrine,” lead editorial, *Daily Telegraph*, London, July 4:

Much attention will no doubt be paid to President Clinton’s remarks in an exclusive interview in today’s *Daily Telegraph* in which he extols both closer European integration and German leadership of the continent. . . .

For Britain, this realignment may have uncongenial consequences in the long term, particularly if pressure were to mount for her to relinquish her seat on the U.N. Security Council. But it is the comparatively precarious democracies of central and Eastern Europe that will derive most cause for concern from President Clinton’s remarks. His recipe for continental stability would appear to be a more active role for both Germany and Russia—their traditional oppressors. . . .

● “Clinton Tells Germans to Be Leaders,” Stephen Robinson, *Daily Telegraph*, July 12:

President Bill Clinton has urged Germany to play a strong leadership role in a more closely integrated European Community and has endorsed Bonn’s current drive, which is opposed by Britain, towards a federal Europe. . . .

His effusive comments about Germany were no doubt intended as a courtesy, but his emphasis on the centrality of the German role went far beyond diplomatic niceties.

Relations with Britain have not been easy since America’s first Oxford-educated President reached the White House, and British officials can be sensitive to any implied snub. During his visit to Britain for the Normandy commemorations Mr Clinton made a point of stressing the ties which link Britain and America. But he reserved his major speech on European policy for the French National Assembly. . . .

● “U.S. Cuts British ‘Special Link,’” by David Gow, *Guardian*, London, July 12:

President Clinton yesterday effectively ended the United States’ “special relationship” with Britain, instead offering Germany a unique partnership with the world’s leading power in forging a united Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals.

Reflecting a tilt in U.S. foreign policy back towards Eu-

rope and away from the Far East, Mr Clinton made plain that the U.S. is intent on creating a special relationship with Germany as the dominant force in promoting European union.

President Clinton, on the first day of a two-day official visit to Germany, reduced the U.S.’s special relationship with Britain to a mere sentimental tie with its mother Country. “It is unique in ways that nothing can ever replace because we grew out of them,” he said.

While he was careful at a news conference on the chancellery lawns to stress that U.S. links with Britain and Germany were different, he played up the primacy of the partnership with Europe’s biggest and most powerful nation.

Central to this new special relationship was how to integrate Europe’s “other half”—the reformed central and east European states, and Russia—into new institutions, which would build greater stability after the Cold War.

. . . The U.S. and Germany are understood to have agreed to set up a working party to discuss ways of extending political and economic security eastwards—a joint Ostpolitik designed to bring countries such as Poland and Hungary closer to the European Union and, eventually, Nato.

● “Clinton Ends the Affair with Britain,” by Murray Ritchie, European Editor, Brussels, *Glasgow Herald*, July 13:

“Nothing will stop us, everything is possible—Berlin is free,” President Bill Clinton cried yesterday from the eastern side of the Brandenburg Gate in Berlin. The phrasing might not have carried the same ring as John F. Kennedy’s “Ich bin ein Berliner” but the message, as far as Britain was concerned, was deadly. Any lingering notion that the United Kingdom and the United States still enjoy the so-called special relationship which puts British-American interests first among equals is fantasy.

The truth is now unmistakable. Mr Clinton, the best American political operator since Kennedy, is behaving in character by responding to the reality of political power in Europe and identifying himself with it. . . .

Of course, there were the usual belated and placatory noises from Mr Clinton and White House officials about the effect of the Berlin speech on American relationships with Britain. And in London the Foreign Office was at pains to dismiss his words as just another burst of romantic exuberance by a young President. But the truth must hurt John Major and other British Atlanticists who still hanker nostalgically for the days when the special relationship really existed, even in the bizarre *On Golden Pond* style of the Thatcher-Reagan era. . . .

This affair demonstrates with almost hurtful clarity the extent of the United Kingdom’s decline not just as a world power—which has been evident for half of this century—but as a European one. . . . Like the dead parrot in the Monty Python sketch, this is an ex-special relationship. . . .



A sample of German press from July 12 and 13: "Clinton: Germany No. 1 Partner. U.S. President Expects Undertaking of Greater Responsibilities. Private Meeting with Kohl in the Evening" (Berliner Zeitung); "Clinton's Brandenburg Gate Speech Highpoint of German Visit" (Tagesspiegel); "America—in the Midst of Berlin" (Berliner Allgemeine Zeitung); "First Visit in Unified Berlin. President Bill Clinton Lauds German Values" (Handelsblatt); "Clinton: 'We Are on Your Side, Now and Forever. 40,000 Celebrate the President. Bill Clinton in Berlin Calls for Throwing a Bridge Between East and West'" (Berliner Zeitung); "Clinton: America Stands at Your Side. Berlin Prepares Enthusiastic Reception for Presidential Couple. First Speech by a U.S. President in the Eastern Part of the City" (Tagesspiegel); "'Nothing Can Hold Us Back.' The Historic Speech of President Clinton at the Brandenburg Gate. First Visit by an American President after the Fall of the Wall in Berlin" (Tagesspiegel); "Berlin Celebrates Clinton: 40,000 in 29 Degrees [centigrade] at Brandenburg Gate" (Die Welt); "Clinton in Berlin: A Historic Speech" (Bild-Zeitung).

Americans, especially those of Clinton's generation, show little sympathy for the residual resentment of a successful Germany which surfaces in France and Britain. He knows Germany is the key to a new, larger, more integrated Europe which cannot come about without German political clout and economic assistance. . . .

- "Clinton Tour Shows U.S. Loss of Direction," *Financial Times*, London, July 15:

In Bonn, Mr. Clinton spoke of "a common partnership that is unique now because so many of our challenges are just to Germany's east."

The "special relationship" with the U.K. he consigned to the status of a nostalgic curio: "Even though we fought two wars with them early in the last century it is unique in ways that nothing can ever replace because we grew out of them."

**In Germany**

- "The Hand Reaches Out and There's Nothing There. Reflections in London About the Changed Relations with North America," by Bernhard Heimrich, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, July 14:

LONDON, July 13. The "special relationship" between Great Britain and the United States has not, in reality, always been so special. Yet some in London shrank back in horror when President Clinton now officially declared it a thing of the past, and in the German capital of Berlin, of all places.

As the most important inspiration for British foreign policy the architects of the Foreign Office have carved over the splendid entrance stairway Psalm 67. . . . More concretely . . . facing the "waiting room of the ambassadors," a door away from the foreign minister's office, a mural gives the

mandate to generations of British policy: Britannia stretches her hand across the sea toward "America—the biggest of the republics." Through these halls, for some time the feeling has been creeping, that the hand is reaching out, and more and more, there is nothing there.

. . . After the last world war, Winston Churchill in his famous Iron Curtain speech of March 1946 in Fulton, Missouri described the basis upon which the future of this divided world could be mastered: "a special relationship between the Commonwealth and the United States of America."

The Commonwealth today only has a sentimental meaning, and since the collapse of the Iron Curtain, London has belatedly begun to prepare itself for a future in which the "special relationship" is now only history.

. . . President Clinton was even a student at Oxford and has more former Rhodes Scholars among his troops than any predecessor; but . . . Clinton himself cannot forget that the British Conservatives worked against him during his electoral campaign against President Bush.

● "Clinton's Berlin Signal," by Heinz Kurtzbach, *Berliner Zeitung*, July 15:

. . . Bill Clinton has left behind a threefold signal, the signal from Berlin.

First: The appeal to the Germans not to let the chances from unity wither, but to courageously use them. That an American says this in the shadow of the Brandenburg Gate is already meaningful and worth thinking about.

Second: The appeal to young Germans to grasp the company of people of different origins as enriching. This from a man who is President of a multicultural society (however well or less well it may function) also must be thought over. . . .

Third: The commitment of the Americans to the transatlantic community and the directing of this community to the stabilization of democratic beginnings in former eastern and central Europe. It was no accident that Clinton went to the Baltics and Poland before his Germany trip, and it was also emphatically more than mere polite reverence toward Europe, that the president of the EU Commission [Delors] yesterday stood beside Clinton and Kohl in the Reichstag. . . .

● "Teutons on the March: After Clinton's Speech, France Wants to Learn to Love Germany." by Jürg Altwegg, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, July 16:

PARIS, July 15. Mitterrand intimate . . . Pierre Berger commented, "I can only repeat myself. We share with the Germans a most important part of European culture. We were enemies for a long time—but no longer than with the English—and now we have learned to know one another. And to love each other."

● "Grace on the Sidelines. Without Clinton's Help: England's Anxiety about the German Giant," by Gina Thomas, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, July 16.

Agitation rules in England. The tabloid press is a bit less indignant than usual, because the subject hardly suits sensationalist headlines, but there is no lack of worried com-

mentaries in the leading newspapers. Whatever President Clinton's Berlin remarks mean, there can be no doubt that the Britons feel stricken in their self-esteem. For decades they have vaunted their direct links to Washington, like teacher's pets, against the other European nations.

The Special Relationship between England and America . . . was much more than a cornerstone of British foreign policy. It mirrored the world outlook of a nation which felt itself more strongly drawn toward its cousins on the other side of the Atlantic than toward the European continent. The traditional affinity to America always went hand in hand with the country's security interests; . . .

Now Clinton has gone so far as to flaunt for German-American relations the term *Special Relationship* [in text in English] which the English up to now saw as their privilege. . . . The *Daily Mail*, which loves to beat the anti-German drums, spoke of an "unholy alliance" between Clinton and Kohl.

"Don't Count on Berlin," reads the headline of a commentary by William Rees-Mogg in the *Times*. . . . Rees-Mogg compares Great Britain, France, and Germany, which all woo the favor of America, with the three Graces. . . .

A feeling of injustice, that the British had won the war, but then have to experience how they have fallen further and further behind their vanquished enemy, reinforces the resentment. . . .

For years no constructive initiatives have come out of London. . . . Clinton has now bestowed the [Special Relationship] crown on [Germany]. Even if his Berlin utterances were not seen as a shift in American foreign policy, but rather as a form of courtesy, his appearance has symbolic force. England feels exactly that.

## Italy, United States

● "July 14: Germans in Paris. The New Season of Europe Opens," by Arturo Pellegrini, *Il Popolo*, daily of the Italian Popular Party, Rome, July 15:

London, orphan of the "special link" which she has cultivated for half a century with Washington, intends to oppose the candidacy of [Jacques] Santer, whom she sees and not wrongly as a threat to her design for a Europe limited to the single market. . . .

● *Houston Chronicle*, July 17:

In his apparent enthusiasm to embrace Germany in perpetual partnership, President Clinton has risked throwing both caution and historical memory to the winds. . . .

There is puzzlement and hard feeling over this elsewhere in Europe. It is being read by some as Clinton's de facto proclamation of Germany as this country's principal ally and helpmate in the coming years. For good reason, that makes many uncomfortable.

The British are expressing particular concern that their longstanding "special relationship" with this country may be nearing an end as the result of the president's remarks. . . .