

security situation for the United States. . . . So whether or not these countries . . . develop as democracies is important to this building and to our national security, so that dangers to democracy is a . . . national security interest of the United States.”

‘Democracy building’ is the new imperialism

For those familiar with the nasty machinations of the U.S. National Endowment for Democracy, which has used the guise of “democracy building” to foment political destabilizations in countries that have run afoul of Anglo-American colonial policy, the Clinton strategy’s emphasis on “democracy” should hold ominous overtones. The administration plans to deploy somewhere on the order of \$5 billion of the Defense Department budget to “democracy building” and related activities. In their press briefing, both Aspin and Powell alluded to the new “democracy-building” role which the U.S. military has begun to take on, pointing to Somalia as a case in point.

This emphasis on “democracy” (read: subversion) comes in part from Morton H. Halperin, Clinton’s nominee to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Democracy and Peacekeeping, who participated in the drafting of the administration’s strategic overhaul.

Formerly a leading figure in the circles around the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington, Halperin’s own views on the importance of “democracy” as an instrument for extending Anglo-American political power can be found in an article he wrote for the Summer 1993 issue of *Foreign Policy* magazine.

“The United States should take the lead in promoting the trend toward democracy,” Halperin wrote. “When a people attempts to hold free elections and establish a constitutional democracy, the United States should not only assist but should ‘guarantee’ the result. Those measures should be institutionalized in organizations like the United Nations and the Organization of American States, which would be responsible for carrying out missions to ensure the success of constitutional democracy.”

Halperin called on the “international community” to “establish a process that parallels the provision of the U.S. Constitution, under which the federal government should be obliged to guarantee each state what was in 1789 called a ‘republican’ form of government.”

If the American people saw that U.S. policymakers “were promoting democracy around the globe,” Halperin argued, “they would be more likely to support American policy with financial commitments and *military action* when necessary to accomplish those foreign policy objectives” (emphasis added).

PD-13

Halperin’s emphasis on the importance of the United Nations and the “international community” to U.S. strategy goes to the heart of the Clinton “Bottom-Up Review”: its reliance on multilateral institutions. The controversial Presidential Directive-13, which has been circulating privately for the past month, reportedly proposes giving even greater authority to the U.N. over U.S. military operations (see *EIR*, Sept. 10, “Will U.S. Troops Enforce a Russian ‘Monroe Doctrine’?”).

LaRouche: Gore-Clinton plan is ‘just cosmetics’

In an interview with the radio program “EIR Talks” on Sept. 8, political prisoner Lyndon LaRouche made these comments:

EIR: I’d like you to comment on the recent Gore-Clinton proposal for reducing federal jobs by 250,000 jobs over the next five years. It’s supposedly a government reorganization plan. I know in the past, in 1984, you had a program for government reorganization. How does this compare to yours?

LaRouche: It’s just cosmetics. They’re under tremendous pressure. Clinton has not had a single success so far. He talks about the budgetary bill he got through. That was no success. The Congress and he both *had* to have a bill. No matter what was in it, they had to pass it, so that the

federal government would be manageable. Without that budget, you get to the point where the U.S. government starts to run on chits, because by law it doesn’t have the budgetary authority to continue operation. So they *had* to get a budget through — no matter what was in it.

Clinton’s earlier efforts to get some kind of stimulus program going, even the most modest kind, was shot down. His health plan is in deep trouble. NAFTA [the North American Free Trade Agreement] is a disaster; and in Washington, they’re scrambling. They’re trying to find some token they can throw out there, which, for its short-term advertising and public relations effect, will restore some credibility of motion to the administration. They’re trying to get some momentum going from some place; and so far, they have failed to do it.

This is just a game, it doesn’t really mean anything at all, it just contributes to the overall disaster, it’s just more sliding down a greased slope toward the precipice. That’s all it amounts to. One shouldn’t get too excited about it — maybe a little bit disgusted, but otherwise, not too excited.