

## It's past time to fire Madeleine Albright

by Scott Thompson

On Nov. 8, U.S. State Department spokesman Jamie Rubin delivered a shocking statement to the press during his regular daily briefing. Speaking with the full authority of Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, Rubin delivered a strong castigation of the Russian government's military operations in Chechnya.

"Like other countries," Rubin began, "Russia has assumed obligations under the Geneva Conventions and commitments under the OSCE [Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe] Code of Conduct on political-military aspects of security. The conduct of Russia's current campaign is not in keeping with these commitments. The costs of this approach are too high—costs in humanitarian terms, damage to Russia's international reputation, and in the end making it harder to achieve a political solution." When pressed on specific violations he had in mind, Rubin responded, "What I can say, is that the indiscriminate use of force and the impact of escalation on innocent civilians is a matter of deep concern to us. There are obligations under the Geneva Conventions and commitments under the OSCE Code of Conduct on political-military aspects of security, and our analysis indicates that the conduct of Russia's current campaign is not in keeping with these commitments. I can try to get you, after the briefing, perhaps, more detail on the specific provisions we're concerned about."

The comments by State Department spokesman Rubin were played up in the Clinton administration-hating *Washington Times* the next morning.

And yet, when *EIR* asked about the nature of the alleged violations the following day's White House briefing, press spokesman Joe Lockhart expressed surprise. "I'm not aware

that any such accusations have been raised," he said. "I'm aware that the question was raised at the State Department briefing yesterday, and we certainly have expressed our concern about the indiscriminate violence and civilian casualties. We certainly believe that the Russians are obligated to live by the Geneva Convention and other such obligations that they have undertaken, but I'm not aware that we have evidence that they have violated those."

National Security Council officials indicated to *EIR* that they also were shocked by the State Department's comments, and had made official inquiries as to where Rubin got authorization to make such damning statements, contradicting White House policy on a most sensitive strategic matter, at the heart of U.S. relations with Moscow.

The incident underscored that, once again, the State Department of "Mad Madeleine" Albright was working behind President Clinton's back, taking actions that sharply contradicted the spirit and letter of the President's own policy. Not coincidentally, two days later, Zbigniew Brzezinski—National Security Adviser in the Trilateral Commission's Jimmy Carter administration, and Albright's mentor—in a commentary in the *Wall Street Journal*, another "Get Clinton" publication of record—demanded the administration take action against Russia's crackdown in Chechnya.

Since the day she was brought into the State Department, Albright has acted like a pit bull for a conception of U.S. hegemony, which has created one disaster after another for President Clinton.

The time is long since arrived for the President to fire Albright and to reassert White House control over the foreign policy of the United States—before we find ourselves facing

a string of global catastrophes that lead, ultimately, to World War III.

### **‘Beta Al’ and ‘Mad Madeleine’**

It was Vice President Al Gore, Jr. — not President Clinton — who rammed Albright’s nomination as Secretary of State through the administration in late 1996. And, it was the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Jesse Helms (R-N.C.), one of the President’s most outspoken enemies on the Hill, who on Jan. 8, 1997 performed a *pas de deux* with Albright, to assure her confirmation.

As we show below, Albright has created traps from which President Clinton has yet to extricate himself. For example, according to the May 17, 1997 *New York Times*, in an article entitled “Winning Friends for Foreign Policy: Albright’s First 100 Days,” she reached out to her mentor, British asset Brzezinski, whose latest book, *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives*, advocates the breakup of Russia into several micro-states, to enable Western cartels to loot the remains of its strategic raw materials wealth. Brzezinski’s current employer is British Petroleum, the crown jewel of Her Majesty’s oil empire.

According to the *New York Times*, Albright has also reached out to protect hedge fund predator and “British Golem” George Soros, whose depredations have smashed the economies of nation-states in a large parts of the world, especially among the former “Tigers” in Southeast Asia.

Despite repeated Russian protests of the danger of Brzezinski’s plans for NATO expansion, and for pitting Islam against Russia, and despite Malaysian Prime Minister Dr. Mahathir bin Mohamad’s exposés of Soros’s financial crimes, well-informed sources report that Albright continues to take advice regularly from both these British lackeys.

### **Hand in hand with Jesse Helms**

The evidence that it was Gore who hand-picked U.S. Ambassador to the UN Albright to replace Warren Christopher as Secretary of State, comes from one of Gore’s closest friends, Martin Peretz, publisher of the *New Republic*. In a Feb. 17, 1997 article, in which Peretz boasted that he was “Al’s Pal,” Peretz reported: “‘The President doesn’t make decisions without consulting Gore. He just doesn’t.’ That’s what one of the President’s aides told *Newsweek*. Maybe. Myself, I tend to be selective in seeing Gore’s fingerprints on Clinton’s policies. Mostly I see them on the policies that I like. The policies I don’t like, I think my friend had nothing to do with. There are matters, though, where I know objectively Gore made his influence felt. Bosnia is one. There are others. The appointment of Madeleine Albright as Secretary of State carried the mark of the Vice President’s hard-line approach.”

On Jan. 8, 1997, Senator Helms presided over Albright’s confirmation hearings. A review of the official proceedings of that hearing shows that Helms turned the hearings into a love-fest, engaging Albright on questions ranging from reli-



*Mad Madeleine Albright, with her British cronies, arrogated to themselves the right to bomb anybody they wanted to bomb, whether or not the UN Security Council approved it.*

gious persecution of “prisoners of conscience” in the People’s Republic of China, to expanding NATO as far as possible to surround Russia, to stopping “rogue states” from developing chemical weapons. The only subject on which the two disagreed, was over Albright’s defense of Vice President Gore’s lunatic formula for the reduction of “greenhouse gases,” negotiated at the climate conference in Kyoto, Japan.

Helms promised to “expedite” her confirmation, and, after the hearings, the May 17, 1997 *New York Times* reported: “Ms. Albright says she is trying to establish a popular, bipartisan base for foreign policy — and its costs — in a divided government where the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is a conservative Senator from North Carolina, Jesse Helms, with whom she was photographed walking hand in hand.”

Helms kept his word, and Albright was overwhelmingly confirmed as Secretary of State shortly afterward. That should have set off alarm bells at the White House, that Albright was hardly a “friend of Bill.”

## **‘Song and dance’ routine**

It was in November 1998, at a summit in Kuala Lumpur of the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation Forum (APEC), hosted by Malaysia’s Prime Minister Dr. Mahathir bin Mohamad, that Gore and Albright carried out a “song and dance” routine that represents one of the worst foreign policy debacles of the Clinton administration. Gore delivered a speech on behalf of the United States, that most Asian leaders saw as a call to overthrow their host nation’s government.

President Clinton originally had been scheduled to attend the APEC event, where he was to have met for the first time with Russian Prime Minister Yevgeni Primakov, as well as with Chinese President Jiang Zemin, whom he had visited in July. But the President, at the last moment, decided to stay in Washington, to fend off pressures from Gore, Albright, and others on the so-called “Principals Committee” of senior national security advisers, to launch a war against Iraq.

Instead of President Clinton staging a vital summit with Asian and Pacific leaders, according to the Nov. 17, 1998 *New York Times* (“Gore, in Malaysia, Says Its Leaders Suppress Freedom”), Gore gave a speech blasting Prime Minister Mahathir, ostensibly over his recent firing of Deputy Prime Minister and Finance Minister Anwar Ibrahim, the darling of the International Monetary Fund.

Gore railed: “Democracies have done better in coping with economic crisis than nations where freedom is suppressed. Democracy confers a stamp of legitimacy that reforms must have in order to be effective. And so, among nations suffering economic crisis, we continue to hear calls for democracy and reform in many languages—people’s power, *doi moi, reformasi*.”

These were the very slogans being used by Anwar’s followers, who were then rioting in the streets.

“It was the most disgusting speech I’ve heard in my life,” Malaysian Trade Minister Rafidah Aziz told reporters afterward. To cap things off, Albright announced that she intended to meet with Anwar’s wife, Wan Azizah Wan Ismail, which, the *New York Times* reported, she did on Nov. 16, the day before Gore’s diplomatic slap at his host.

According to the Malaysian daily *The Star* of Nov. 16, Trade Minister Rafidah said of the visit: “For someone [Albright] who has been to this country only twice, it is very unfair, unbecoming, and uncalled for. As Malaysians, we take offense.”

This was not the first time that Albright had gone “off script” to slam the Malaysian leader. In late July 1997, while attending the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) Regional Forum in Malaysia, Albright jumped in to defend speculator Soros from harsh criticism by Dr. Mahathir, following Soros’s hedge funds’ assault on the Thai, Malaysian, Indonesian, and the Philippines currencies. According to Godfrey D. Fortune’s *Fortune Newsletter* of March 3, 1998, Albright had taken the occasion to tell the London *Financial Times* that Soros is “a valued citizen who has done much good

in the world. He is not involved in any financial dealings anywhere in Southeast Asia.” It was a baldfaced lie.

Not only did the Secretary of State blame weaknesses in the “Asian Tigers” economies for their plight, but she mocked the host, Dr. Mahathir, in a disgusting song and dance skit that was held at the end of the meeting. According to the July 29, 1997 *New York Times*, in an article entitled “Madeleine Albright Sings Out,” the Secretary dressed as the late Eva Peron, and sang a parody of “Don’t Cry for Me, Argentina,” from the Broadway hit “Evita,” whose lyrics were as follows:

“Don’t cry for me ASEANies,  
“The truth is I always loved you.  
“All through the SLORC days  
“and the Hun Sen days . . .  
“I came here to talk to your leaders  
“But they were all on the golf course  
“So I went back to  
“Sunway Laguna  
“And called George Soros,  
“Talked market forces  
“Hatched a conspiracy  
“The rest is history.”

Thus, the world witnessed the Secretary of State of the United States doing a tawdry song and dance routine to defend the destroyer of Malaysia’s currency, George Soros, giving new meaning to the term, “Ugly American.”

## **Madeleine’s ‘lovely little war’**

As early as spring 1998, Albright had begun to sound out allies for a potential use of NATO for a war against Yugoslavia over the ostensible “ethnic cleansing” being carried out against ethnic Albanians in Kosovo. She found a willing accomplice in British Foreign Secretary Robin Cook, who is head of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office. Both thought that this would provide a new role for “NATO out-of-area deployments,” while creating a running sore in order to destabilize what Brzezinski calls the “Eurasian Balkans”—the Transcaucasus and Central Asia—on the southern flank of Russia. This process of “globalization of NATO” was anathema to the Russians.

At the subsequent meetings at Rambouillet, which were co-chaired by Cook and French Foreign Minister Hubert Védrine, the Russians, who had been part of the original Contact Group that was to have resolved the Balkan crises, were increasingly frozen out, and were faced with both repeated threats of military action against Yugoslavia, from the U.S. State Department and the British, and plans to bypass the UN Security Council and have NATO carry out the strikes unilaterally.

During the negotiations, Yugoslav dictator Slobodan Milosevic was confronted with a codicil that called for NATO occupation not only of Kosovo, but also of the remainder of Yugoslavia (Montenegro and Serbia). Not only did a second codicil call for autonomy for Kosovo, but, when Albright

visited the talks, she promised the Kosovo Liberation Army's (KLA) political head, Hashim Thaqi, a role in a NATO-occupied Kosovo. On Oct. 10, 1998, according to the *New York Times* in an article entitled "NATO Nears Final Order to Approve Kosovo Strike," Albright was quoted as signing off on these codicils, because of Milosevic's "accumulated barbarity" against Kosovo. She left Milosevic with no way out, other than to fight.

Already on Oct. 7, 1998, Russia had rejected NATO unilateral action, and stated that military action was an issue to be settled by the UN Security Council, where, they vowed, they would use their veto to stop it. Russian officials warned of "serious international consequences" if NATO used force without such authority. Russian Prime Minister Yevgeni Primakov was set to have a meeting with Clinton on March 23, 1999, which Clinton had upgraded to the status of a state visit. The two, who had never met, were to discuss a host of strategic issues, including the renewed bombing of Iraq and the extremely dangerous Balkans crisis. But on March 26, the Vice President, behind the President's back, phoned Primakov, who was then in Iceland, en route to Washington, stating that the bombing would start during his visit, regardless of what he had to say about Serbia.

In an article on March 26, the *New York Times* Washington correspondent wrote that "the impending visit of Prime Minister Yevgeni Primakov became a focal point that helped push the administration to act sooner than it had planned" to bomb Yugoslavia. The correspondent pinpointed the traitorous role of Gore and Albright: "And as the White House moved closer to using the force it did not want to, the most hawkish member of the foreign policy team, Secretary Albright . . . was able to hold her own in the inner sanctums. The Primakov trip was important because initially the White House thought it would delay military action against the Yugoslav President Milosevic, until after the Russian leader's trip."

Gore argued that the "credibility" of NATO was more important than ministering to the sensibilities of Russia. "He made the case that you do not want to subordinate NATO's interest to Russia and give Milosevic another week to clean up," an administration official told the *Times* on Gore's behalf.

Primakov was left with no alternative but to turn his plane around, and head back to Moscow.

Recently, evidence has come to light that the extent of the ethnic Albanian "cleansing" had been grossly exaggerated, including by Albright. However, the worst debacle during the war was the May 7 bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade. The overwhelming evidence indicates that the bombing was intentional, but that it was not carried out with the approval of President Clinton—contrary to what the Danish daily *Politiken*, and the French Defense Ministry have recently proclaimed. As in the sabotage of the Rambouillet negotiations, and the later sabotage of the Primakov-Clinton

summit, the perpetrators were Albright, Gore, and their British partner-in-crime, Robin Cook.

## Sheer hatred of Sudan

As early as 1996, UN Ambassador Albright had proclaimed Sudan to be "a viper's nest of terrorists." She has constantly pressed for tougher sanctions against Sudan on this basis, without once producing any proof. In December 1997, Albright, and her side-kick, Assistant Secretary of State for Africa Susan Rice, travelled to the British Commonwealth state of Uganda, which is ruled by British marcher-lord Yoweri Museveni, to urge him to join with terrorist John Garang and his Sudanese People's Liberation Army to forge a "confederation" in Sudan, which would de facto partition northern and southern Sudan.

(Garang, whom Albright met with, was recently officially labelled a "terrorist" by the UN Economic and Social Council, when it removed Christian Solidarity International's non-governmental organization status for using Garang as its spokesman at the UN Commission on Human Rights. CSI-U.K.'s head, Baroness Caroline Cox, has also been working closely with Garang and Uganda to perpetuate civil war in Sudan—all purportedly in the name of saving "Christianity.")

Not only did Albright and Rice meet with Garang, but on their 1997 visit they also met with all the leaders of the rebel National Democratic Alliance (NDA), of which Garang is a leader; shortly thereafter the NDA, in combination with Uganda, Ethiopia, and Eritrea, invaded Sudan.

After the Aug. 7, 1998 terrorist bombings of the U.S. embassies in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania and Nairobi, Kenya, which killed more than 250 people, Sudan arrested two individuals suspected of involvement in the attacks, and offered to turn them over to U.S. authorities. Instead, despite interest by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Albright ignored the request and blocked any investigation. Then, on Aug. 20, 1998, without warning, the United States launched a cruise missile attack that destroyed the Al-Shifa pharmaceutical plant in Khartoum, the capital of Sudan.

This attack, an act of war, had been planned by the Principals' Committee on Aug. 17, 1998, while President Clinton was pre-occupied with his scheduled appearance before the Kenneth Starr grand jury. The Principals' Committee meeting was run, in President Clinton's absence, by Vice President Gore and Secretary of State Albright. Actually, the Principals had decided to bomb two targets in Sudan, the second being a tannery. But Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Gen. Henry Shelton had been so alarmed at the possibility of civilian casualties, that he called President Clinton and got his permission to remove the tannery from the target list.

Subsequently, the *New York Times* learned that the only source of information that the Al-Shifa plant had allegedly been producing chemical warfare agents for British terrorist stooge Osama bin Laden, had been a single soil sample taken across the road from the plant by an Egyptian agent of dubious

credentials; upon analysis, the sample was found to have a small quantity of the precursor chemical EMPTA.

Despite the widespread exposure of the hoax behind the Al-Shifa bombing, Albright is again stoking the fires of war against Sudan. On Oct. 23, 1999, she visited Kenya and met once again with terrorist leader Garang. Albright heaped praise on Garang, stating that he “is a very dynamic leader who has a goal that is difficult to fulfill because he is not recognized in the international system.” During her trip, she also met once again with Britain’s puppet Museveni, to mobilize him against Sudan.

### **Madeleine joins the FARC**

In yet another area of vital concern for the national security of the United States and the Western Hemisphere, Albright has been waging a most visible war against the White House—this time, against the President’s adviser on national anti-drug policy, Gen. Barry McCaffrey (ret.).

On July 16, 1999, at a Washington, D.C. press conference with Colombian military officials at his side, McCaffrey polemicized strongly that, unless the United States provided immediate aid to the Colombian Armed Forces and National Police, the narco-terrorist FARC and ELN threatened to overrun that country. The situation is a “near-emergency,” he said, and “U.S. support for Colombia is inadequate. There should be no closed door to any Colombian request.” He sent a private letter to Albright, proposing that the United States allocate \$1 billion in emergency military equipment, training, and intelligence back-up, to avert a disaster. State Department officials responsible for combatting narcotics and terrorism weighed in with support for McCaffrey’s position.

Albright personally went to war against McCaffrey. First, her office leaked McCaffrey’s private communiqué to the press, to preempt him from building a “quiet consensus” inside the administration and Congress for the emergency aid to Colombia. Next, she wrote an editorial commentary, published in the Aug. 10 *New York Times*, peddling the lie that Colombia’s “38 years of struggle” could not be won militarily, and could only be ended by negotiating with the narco-terrorists.

As Albright was conducting this bureaucratic war against the President’s senior drug policy adviser, the FARC terrorists were escalating their dirty war against the civilian population of Colombia, and building up their narco state-within-a-state, in the so-called “demilitarized zone” given to them in the southern part of Colombia by President Andrés Pastrana.

On Nov. 10, President Clinton announced that the issue of aid to Colombia would not be taken up this year. The President promised that the emergency authorization would be a top priority for the administration—once Congress reconvened in January 2000. In the case of Colombia, Albright did not have to overtly win the policy fight—as she did in the Balkans—to produce horrific consequences for American national security interests.

It is long past time that she be fired for cause.

## **Int’l Criminal Court and humanitarian intervention debated**

by Edward Spannaus

In July 1998, one hundred and twenty nations meeting in Rome decided to establish an International Criminal Court (ICC), with jurisdiction over genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, and the as-yet-undefined crime of aggression. UN Secretary General Kofi Annan hailed this as “a giant step forward in the march toward universal human rights and the rule of law.”

The United States, which had initially supported the creation of such a tribunal, voted against it at Rome, fearing that U.S. officials could be dragged before the court. Thus the United States finds itself in what many consider a paradoxical, if not hypocritical position: It wants to arrogate to itself (together with Britain) the right to take unilateral military action (i.e., wage war) on other states, such as Iraq, Sudan, or Yugoslavia, yet it does not wish to be subject to any legal claims that could arise out of those actions.

There are sound reasons for opposing the establishment of an International Criminal Court—reasons which, unfortunately, are not the basis for the current U.S. position; these pertain to the fundamental issue of national sovereignty, and the impossibility of the existence of any sort of positive international criminal law short of the abolition of national sovereignty and the creation of some form of global government.

The issues around the ICC, and the dilemma in which the United States now finds itself, were the subject of a contentious panel discussion during a two-day conference of the American Bar Association’s Standing Committee on Law and National Security, in Washington on Oct. 28-29.

(The Standing Committee on Law and National Security is an outgrowth of the British-inspired, anti-Communist “rule of law” frenzy of the 1950s and 1960s; since its inception, its primary funders have been foundations associated with the CIA- and British intelligence-trained billionaire Richard Mellon Scaife.)

Leading off the panel discussion, State Department representative Thomas Warwick, the Deputy to the U.S. Ambassador-at-Large for War Crimes issues, identified a number of areas which the United States finds most troubling, including the possibility of politically motivated charges (i.e., that a Milosevic could bring charges against U.S. officials), the definition of “aggression,” and that the defined crime of transferring populations into already-occupied areas, could be ap-