

President Clinton counters British policy offensive

by Jeffrey Steinberg

The British Crown has once again dramatically escalated its assault against the U.S. presidency. Hoping to exploit the Nov. 8 Republican Party congressional victories, London's assets in the American media and among the George Bush and neo-conservative factions of the Republican Party and the U.S. intelligence community have revived the "Whitewater" offensive that they launched one year ago.

And in the Balkans, the British have thrown their weight behind Serbian genocide, in a surrogate attack against Clinton administration foreign policy. Since late November, the British Crown's propaganda machinery has been targeting the Clinton administration for its adamant opposition to the British sellout of Bosnia, to British efforts to further fracture the Atlantic Alliance, and to Britain's drive to draw Russia into an anti-American, anti-German policy bloc—a new "Triple Entente."

The British offensive has provoked a counterattack, however—not only from the Clinton administration itself, but also from some leading Republicans.

Clinton's Bosnia initiative

One day after the elections, President Clinton announced that the United States was withdrawing from the U.N. arms embargo against the Bosnian government. Part of the U.S. pullout involved the withholding from the British and the U.N. of intelligence on arms supplies to the Bosnians.

This caused a furor in London, in that it represented a further substantial escalation in the Clinton administration's ongoing policy break with London. Since that policy shift, British-influenced news agencies on both sides of the Atlantic have been cranking out stories about America abandoning the NATO alliance, about foreign policy waffling on the part of the Clinton White House, about a backdown of Clinton

support for the Bosnian government, etc. The common denominator of all of these stories has been their total lack of truthfulness.

On Nov. 29, the *Washington Post* and the *New York Times* ran front-page headlines proclaiming that the Clinton White House had abandoned its commitments to support the Bosnian regime: "Clinton Aides Favor Concessions to Serbs" (the *Post*) and "U. S. in Shift Gives Up Talk of Tough Action Against Serbs" (the *Times*).

Hours later, White House spokesman Dee Dee Myers set the record straight, telling reporters that a National Security Council meeting the previous day had unequivocally endorsed a continuation of the "U.S. engagement in Bosnia. . . . It is our policy to remain engaged as we have been." Myers reiterated the Clinton administration's opposition to any kind of federation between Serbia and the Serbian sections of Bosnia, a move that would be tantamount to a cave-in to British and French appeasement. She stated that the United States favored the use of NATO air strikes against Serb positions where appropriate.

The growing chasm between actual Clinton policy and the media version of the administration's stance on the Balkan crisis prompted Democratic Party presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche to issue the following warning on Dec. 1: "As official statements from the White House have now proven, the international news media have been conducting a massive hoax against the people of Europe and the United States, falsely asserting that President Clinton had capitulated to Serbia's de facto London and Paris allies on Balkan policy. This demonstrates, once again, that the international leading news media are not to be believed on any subject; on all important matters, the leading international news media, including virtually all the major news media

of the United States, lie nearly all of the time. After this experience, anyone who cites major news media as authority on facts, is to be regarded with pity as either a political illiterate or perhaps suffering mental illness."

Dole slams the British

If anything, Great Britain's outrageous behavior toward Washington is showing signs of triggering a broader outcry against "Perfidious Albion" on both sides of the congressional aisle. On the eve of a trip to London and then to NATO headquarters in Brussels, Sen. Bob Dole (R-Kan.), the incoming Majority Leader, told NBC-TV's Tim Russert on Nov. 27: "We have a complete breakdown of NATO. We have U.N. vetoing of targets—driven by the British and the French, I must say—primarily the British. . . . It may be time to get the United Nations Protection Forces out of there, redeploy them somewhere. They're not doing their job. . . . Let's get them out of the way. Let's lift the arms embargo. And let's at least let the Bosnians defend themselves."

On Nov. 30, following his meeting with British Prime Minister John Major and other senior British officials, Dole told reporters in London, "Britain's policy on Bosnia is wrong." Asked about the U.N. record there, he snapped "Abysmal. What record?" The next day, the London *Times* banner headline reported, "U.S. Senate Leader's Bosnia Attack Infuriates Britain."

The State Department made it clear that Senator Dole's trip to London and Brussels was being coordinated with the Clinton White House and State Department, and that "he is a person that we expect to be working very, very closely with in a wide range of foreign policy issues."

On Nov. 26, the London *Guardian*, in an article by Jonathan Steele, admitted that the real issue behind the escalating war of words between Washington and London was the Clinton administration's rejection of supranationalism and geopolitical crisis management. Referring to the dispute over NATO and the U.N.'s role in Bosnia, Steele wrote: "This harmful mixture of discrepant missions has been compounded by a broader political problem: the Clinton administration's unwillingness to submit U.S. forces to any kind of supranational United Nations command, even in the post-cold war world where Washington has no rivals. Its 'Policy on Reforming Multilateral Peace Operations,' known as PDD 25, and released in May, says that American forces in U.N. operations 'will always remain under the command of the President.'

"These two ancient American instincts, of unilateralism and a preference for military rather than politico-diplomatic reactions to crises, have exploded in Bosnia. The one-sided U.S. withdrawal from naval supervision of the arms embargo and the well-founded reports of covert American training for Bosnian Muslim forces suggest that the United States has abandoned the last pretense of neutrality in the conflict. It is hardly surprising that Britain and France . . . are angry."

Whitewatergate, take two

The same British Crown/Hollinger Corp. apparatus that one year ago launched the assault against the U.S. presidency via the "Whitewatergate" scandal, wasted little time reviving that destabilization after the November elections. Kenneth Starr, the highly partisan ex-Bush administration solicitor general who is the current Whitewater special prosecutor, has been leaking stories to newspapers for several weeks about the activities of his supposedly secret grand jury. The *Los Angeles Times* and then the *Washington Times* began publicizing grand jury details about a pending indictment against former deputy attorney general and longtime Clinton friend Webster Hubbell.

By Dec. 1, the *Washington Times* was flaunting the fact that there was a "December rerun" of the 1993 media assault against the Clinton presidency. Noting that President Clinton is planning to deliver some important policy speeches in December, the *Times* gloated:

"Mr. Clinton followed a similar path last year when he tried to use the December congressional recess to focus on family values. But that effort was derailed when the *Los Angeles Times* and the *American Spectator* detailed allegations from Arkansas state troopers that they had helped arrange sexual trysts for him when he was governor of Arkansas. . . . The recent Whitewater reports detailing various investigations into the failed Arkansas land deal in which the Clintons were partners threatens to derail White House success."

Right on cue, Sen. Alfonse D'Amato (R-N.Y.), a leading congressional Clinton-basher, called upon Kenneth Starr to expand his probe to include White House aides George Stephanopoulos and Harold Ickle. Already, the media leaks from Starr's office say that key White House aide Bruce Lindsey is under grand jury scrutiny.

Ongoing assassination threat

This spring, when the Hollinger Corp.'s Whitewatergate offensive petered out, one key Clinton-accuser, former Arkansas state employee Larry Nichols, began waving around guns in front of populist audiences calling for Clinton's elimination (see last week's *EIR*). The President has been the target of more death threats and assassination tries than any President since John F. Kennedy.

The Dec. 1 *Washington Times* revealed that there is a growing concern among federal law enforcement and military investigators that these threats are escalating, fueled by the virulent anti-Clinton propaganda. The Naval Investigative Service, according to the *Times* story, is probing an appearance at one of these anti-Clinton rallies by an active duty Air Force counterintelligence officer, and is also investigating a militia group that has been circulating leaflets calling upon active duty military personnel to take action against "all enemies, foreign and domestic." The first name on the leaflet's "enemies list": Bill Clinton.