

## Anti-British foreign policy shift yielding successes

by Edward Spannaus

The historic cease-fire announcement on Aug. 31 by the Irish Republican Army (IRA), which could bring an end to 25 years of British-provoked bloodshed in Northern Ireland, is the latest fruit of the ongoing strategic re-orientation of U.S. foreign policy away from the Anglo-American "special relationship" which has dominated U.S. policy for much of this century.

Although the U.S. daily news media refused to cover it, President Clinton did announce the end of the U.S.-British "special relationship" during his visit to Germany in mid-July. At his press conference in Bonn on July 11, Clinton announced a new, "unique" German-American partnership, and consigned the old U.S.-U.K. special relationship to the history books. The next day, London's *Daily Express* declared: "Links with Britain No Longer So Important," while the London *Guardian* shouted: "U.S. Cuts British 'Special Link'; Clinton Turns His Eyes to Germany," and commented that Clinton had "reduced the U.S.'s special relationship with Britain to a mere sentimental tie with the Mother Country."

They were right. Increasingly, U.S. strategic policy is carried out in cooperation with two new strategic partners: the Vatican and Germany. The re-orientation is by no means complete, and Bush administration policies continue on "auto-pilot" in a number of areas; for example, Haiti. But the new emerging strategic combination has already borne fruit in significant areas including:

- U.N. one-world government schemes around the International Conference on Population and Development have been significantly thwarted by common agreement between President Clinton and Pope John Paul II, despite their disagreement on other matters;
- the Middle East peace breakthroughs, which potentially could bring to an end decades of British geopolitical maneuvering in that region;

- the Balkans, where the U.S.-Germany-Vatican combination has made possible the alliance between Croatia and Bosnia, ending the fighting between them which British Intelligence had fomented to the benefit of the Serbian forces;

- Mexico, where the U.S. government and institutions, in collaboration with the Vatican, stymied the destabilization scenario which emerged with the Chiapas "rebellion" at the beginning of the year.

### Cairo

The U.N. anti-population conference scheduled to begin Sept. 5 in Cairo, Egypt, will be considerably smaller than anticipated, and the one-worlders who have been planning it for years are running up against major opposition to their schemes from Christian and Islamic religious leaders and organizations. Less visible, but equally important, is the agreement reached between Pope John Paul II and President Clinton in June. Following their June 2 meeting, Clinton said that they had discussed "where we agreed and where we didn't." Clinton declared that his administration does not support abortion as a means of birth control, and he stated his firm opposition to coerced population control as has been conducted in China. A few days later, Clinton indicated a fundamental area of agreement with the pope, when he declared his opposition to "utopian world government" schemes.

As statesman and economist Lyndon LaRouche has repeatedly pointed out, it is such one-world government schemes, and not abortion and contraception, which are the fundamental issues of the Cairo conference. In an interview with "EIR Talks" on Aug. 31, LaRouche said that the developments around the Cairo conference are "a major setback" for British agents such as U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali and that host of bureaucrats which the British

and the British Commonwealth have contributed to running the United Nations and most of its non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

"They've taken a slap in the face," LaRouche said. "What has happened is that forces led, in effect, among nations, by the United States, whose President is for the nation-state, not some kind of imperial super-government, and also led otherwise most prominently by Islamic forces, Christian evangelical forces, by the Vatican, and by others, have administered a stinging, partial defeat to this Cairo conference. It's never going to come off the way it was originally intended."

LaRouche identified this as a very important turning point in history, in that the U.N. bureaucracy and what stands behind it is faced with a sort of collapse "because it has run out of usefulness, it has run out of hosts on which to parasitize, it has bled us all pretty dry; and has run out of ideas. It can no longer come up with any policies which give it any prospect for survival as a controlling force on this planet."

### **Northern Ireland**

The Aug. 31 cease-fire announcement by the IRA is acknowledged by observers to be largely the result of the role played by President Clinton. For this, he has received praise even from political opponents such as Rep. Peter King (R-N.Y.), who said on Aug. 31 that Clinton is the first U.S. President to go against the British on the issue of Northern Ireland. The White House acknowledged that this is something that the President "has worked continually on over the past year and a half."

Niall O'Dowd, editor of the New York City-based *Irish Voice*, said on Aug. 31 in Dublin that Clinton and a few others deserve tremendous credit "for not taking the British point of view as the Reagan and Bush administrations have done." He added that the chances of the peace process working are much greater with Clinton in the White House.

Commenting on the truce, LaRouche pointed out that it could not have been done by the IRA by itself, because the British would simply have ignored them. "It could only be done if a major power, like the United States, took a hand in it," he said. "Otherwise, the British were going to keep that thing going forever."

### **China**

Another area where LaRouche identified Clinton as bucking the British is with respect to China. The success of the trade mission to China led by Commerce Secretary Ron Brown (see *Economics*, p. 4) also represents a shift in U.S. policy away from what LaRouche called "the George Bush nonsense." The United States and Britain are "completely, directly at odds" on this issue, LaRouche said. He explained that the British policy is for civil war in China as soon as Deng Xiaoping dies, whereas the U.S. policy is for peaceful development of China through economic cooperation.

### **Europe**

A major strategic shift in the bloody conflict in Bosnia-Herzegovina resulted from the agreement between Croatia and Bosnia signed in Washington on March 18, following over a year of fighting between the two which was directly fomented by British intelligence agents. Knowledgeable sources have confirmed that this agreement was the result of the combined efforts of Germany, the Vatican, and the Clinton administration.

The U.S. special envoy who was instrumental in working out the agreement, Charles Redman, is now likely to be named as the new U.S. ambassador to Germany. The Aug. 30 *Washington Times* noted that this "appears to reflect President Clinton's view, expressed in Berlin in July, that Germany—not France or Britain—is America's key European ally." The *Times* commented that Redman would have far more clout with Washington policymakers than the current U.S. ambassadors to Britain and France.

On the occasion of the Aug. 31 ceremonies marking the final withdrawal of Russian troops from Germany, LaRouche identified the principal implication of this as not the withdrawal of the troops as such, but rather the use of the occasion to officially open up new economic relations between Germany and Russia. LaRouche described this as a continuation of the policy which President Clinton announced in Bonn and Berlin in July—the policy of allying with and cooperating with Germany for the economic development of eastern Europe.

### **The Caribbean and Ibero-America**

It is here that President Clinton has faced some of the most intense destabilization operations directed both against his government, and against the governments and institutions of Ibero-America.

In his interview, LaRouche said that the British have been playing two games against the Clinton administration in the Caribbean. One is through the São Paulo Forum, of which Fidel Castro is a part (see *International*, p. 30). This includes Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas's PRD in Mexico; Luís Inácio "Lula" da Silva in Brazil; and the Causa R (Radical Cause) party in Venezuela. LaRouche credited Clinton with acting properly to neutralize the destabilization threat, by derailing the attempt to flood Florida with Cuban refugees. As for the Mexican elections, LaRouche said on Aug. 25 that Clinton and various U.S. institutions played a decisive role in preventing the political chaos and violence which was expected to result from the August elections. The averting of civil war could not have happened, LaRouche said, unless someone in the United States had said, "Leave this place alone."

While Clinton still faces major destabilizations both at home and abroad, it is clear that he has begun to buck the British in a number of areas, and that British geopolitics and one-world government schemes are in the process of being rejected as the fundamental axioms of postwar U.S. strategic policy. It's no wonder that Clinton's enemies are enraged.