

The American Interest

by Srdja Trifkovic

Gore's Foreign Policy: More of the Same, Only Worse

We have always known that a Gore presidency would continue the flawed foreign policy of the Clinton administration; but now we know that—unlikely as it may sound—things may be even worse if the Vice President wins in November. On the last day of April, Al Gore gave his first major foreign policy speech of the campaign. Speaking to journalists in Boston, he outlined his global vision and also warned against the “risky” policies of his Republican rival, Texas Gov. George W. Bush.

In the key part of his address, Gore singled out the economic prosperity of foreign nations as a vital security interest of the United States. “I believe that now we have a profound responsibility to open the gates of opportunity for all the world’s people,” he said. “Let me be clear: Promoting prosperity throughout the world is a crucial form of forward engagement.”

Old habits of mind die hard, and the distorted trinitarian reflex lingers among Christophobes, too. That’s why secular ideologues and social engineers like to work under tripartite slogans—“*liberté, égalité, fraternité*,” “*ein Reich, ein Volk, ein Führer*.” Perhaps for that reason, to the globalist-interventionists’ mantra of “democracy” and “human rights,” Mr. Gore has now added the third part of the slogan: “prosperity.”

If promoting prosperity in, say, Outer Mongolia or Moldova is deemed to be a vital interest of the United States, then any item of economic policy by their governments that Gore’s globalist-interventionists deem detrimental to that prosperity will provide an instant *casus belli*. Accordingly, in Gore’s world, America’s “vital interests” will keep multiplying at a breathtaking rate. The new challenges will include the existence of customs barriers and protective tariffs in faraway countries—those relics of sovereign nationhood detrimental to “free trade.” Many more doors to free trade will have to be kicked open under Gore. The craters from ordnance manufactured by McDonnell will become the foundations for new McDonalds. Any reluctance of foreigners to “privatize” their key eco-

nomic assets (say by selling them to *Wall Street Journal* subscribers) will warrant airstrikes.

And so, in addition to Clinton’s wars for other peoples’ “human rights,” America will have Gore’s wars for other peoples’ prosperity. Interventions not connected to any clear and imminent threat to U.S. security will continue; indeed, they are part of Gore’s strategy. “Our national security interests can be defined by our values,” he said. From that premise, he even attacked Bush for his lukewarm support of last year’s bombing of Serbia.

One could argue that Bush should have attacked Gore on the administration’s record on the Balkans. This was an issue that could have given Bush some mileage with the millions of Americans who feel uneasy about last year’s bombing of Serbia. But since Bush has chosen to pay lip service to the mainstream orthodoxy, Gore can now accuse Bush of being indecisive and “dangerously fixated on the Cold War past” in his views on the use of force:

[Bush] suggests that he would not intervene to relieve even the brutal repression of ethnic cleansing and genocide. No wonder it took him six weeks to say anything about our action against the ethnic cleansing in Kosovo. Is that the right message for America to send to people around the globe struggling for freedom?

In view of his explicit support for further expansion of NATO, it is interesting that Gore attacked Bush for wrongly viewing Russia and China as U.S. enemies. “While we must remain vigilant against any deterioration in our relationships, the reality of the Global Age is that Russia and China are indeed competitors, but also vital partners in our efforts to tackle problems menacing to us all,” Gore said.

In fact, it is the Clinton-Gore White House that turned Russia into an enemy. Gore is apparently unable to grasp the fact that it is impossible to maintain friendship with Russia and at the same time to advocate further NATO enlargement and to bask in the glory of NATO’s victory over the Serbs. Predictably, how-

ever, the Beltway establishment welcomed his speech. The *Washington Post* editorial on May 2 expressed pleasure that:

Mr. Gore embraced engagement of China and Russia, claimed victory for the Clinton-Gore intervention in Kosovo and promised that he, like Mr. Clinton, would seek an agreement with Moscow to permit development of a limited U.S. missile-defense system against North Korea without sacrificing the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

This is an impossible proposition, but Gore is as oblivious of its incoherence as the *Post*’s editorialist. The administration threatens to abrogate the ABM treaty unless the Russians agree to amend it as desired by Washington. But it is naive, or else deliberately provocative, to expect Vladimir Putin to perform an act of submission that is contrary to his country’s interests and that would make him look weak in the crucial early days of his presidency. If the United States goes ahead with its national missile defense system, abandoning the 1972 treaty, then all bets with Russia may be off. Clinton and Gore claim they can have it both ways. They are wrong. NMD is a bad idea based on unsound science and flawed strategic doctrine.

What we need to make American cities more secure is not a misnamed anti-ballistic shield that may or may not work, but a foreign policy that will not prompt the assorted “rogues” around the world to consider attacking America in the first place. Al Gore is not the man for the job. Temperamentally and intellectually, he is a Clintonite, but—to make things worse—he believes his own propaganda, unlike his present boss. Gore’s “doctrine,” as outlined on April 30, will entangle America in more wars, more interventions, and more lies, all unconnected to this country’s interests, at odds with its tradition, and contrary to the wishes of the vast majority of its people.

To Subscribe:
(800) 877-5159

JULY 2000/41

RELIGION

A Christian Critique of American Foreign Policy

by Jean-Marc Berthoud

My last (and only other) visit to the United States was early in 1986. I was visiting the Capitol at the invitation of a friend who, at the time, was working for a Republican member of the Senate. It was on the day of President Reagan's State of the Union Address. In the silence and solitude of this huge building, I experienced a feeling of awe which I shall never forget. When in Versailles or in Paris, among the palaces of Genoa or walking down Whitehall toward Parliament, one has a vivid sensation of the power which went forth from these great buildings. But what one senses are the vestiges of power, not its reality. In those silent spaces of the Capitol, I was overwhelmed by the presence of a very real power. And I said to myself: "I stand here in the seat of the mightiest power this earth has seen. Woe betide the nations of the world when such a power falls into evil hands."

That same week, I had arranged a meeting with a personal advisor to the President on European and Soviet affairs. I wanted to share with him—and, through him, with the President—my dismay at the extraordinary cordiality Ronald Reagan had displayed toward President Mikhail Gorbachev of the Soviet Union during their meeting in Geneva early in December of the previous year. Such warmth contrasted with Reagan's recent public denunciation of the "Evil Empire." I thought that such effusions could only weaken the Western perception of the great danger that the Soviet Empire represented. When supping with the devil, goes the English proverb, use a long spoon.

On that cold morning in February 1986, I shared such thoughts with the advisor. He listened in silence, then strode

across his office and took a document out of a cabinet. "Look at this," he said. "I gave exactly the same advice to the President before he went to Europe. He paid not the slightest attention to my recommendations."

These anecdotes illustrate the great distance which lay between Reagan's rhetoric and the underlying political reality of cordial fraternization. What really mattered, of course, was the *realpolitik*, not the rhetoric. The events of the next few years were to show that the international political scene had already radically changed.

When Reagan was verbally attacking the Soviet Union, the Cold War had virtually ended. East and West, communism and capitalism had struck a secret bargain. Since the early 60's, Leninist and Stalinist confrontation with the capitalist block had been replaced by the Gramscian revolutionary strategy of penetration, infiltration, seduction, and domination so well described and prophetically analyzed in the 60's and 70's by Anatoli Golitsyn.

From the balance of two hostile blocks, the leaders of the world were moving in the direction of a joint directorate of world affairs, which would unify the planet under a single atheistic, socialist, and pantheistic government. From the communist perspective, this reorientation took on the names of Eurocommunism (in Italy); the Prague Spring (in Czechoslovakia); communism with a human face (all over); and finally, the *coup de grâce*, *perestroika* and *glasnost*.

In the West, the major turning point was 1968, when all the vital institutions of Western society—the media, the universities, the major churches, the judiciary, the educational organizations, etc.—were penetrated by Gramscian methods of cultural revolution. The results have been spectacular. It is instructive to draw up a short list of this New Class, this universal *nomenclatura*: Prodi, Solanas, Jospin, Blair, Schroeder, Mandela, Mbeki, and last, but not least, President William Jefferson Clinton. The convergence of East and West was symbolized by that extraordinary display of Russian communist flags over Washington at the end of the Reagan era. The new form of international communism had taken

over the levers of command. Ecologists and pacifists (the German Greens, for example) could now, without a qualm, rain death and destruction on the Balkans because they held the reins of power. For their purpose, in the end, was not ecological stability or the promotion of peace, but a new revolutionary agenda. And the maintenance (and exercise) of the most brutal power was no obstacle in advancing such aims.

Communism, unlike fascism or Nazism, is not a national phenomenon, but a long-term international enterprise. After communism totally exhausted the human resources of Russia, the revolution nimbly transferred to a relatively healthy organism: the United States of America. Washington replaced Moscow as the center of world revolution. This, it would seem to me, is one of the basic lessons we can draw from the Clinton era.

What else explains why such men as Augusto Pinochet and Helmut Kohl have become the objects of judicial persecution? Why not attack left-wing figures who, by their utopian ideology, are far more liable to become political killers or candidates for corruption? The answer is simple. The socialist axe now being wielded by the governments of the West has fallen into the hands of our new-style revolutionaries. And such men are determined to exact revenge on men who, in various ways, destroyed the communist revolution. One of the reasons Yugoslavia has been subjected to such astonishing disinformation, calumny, and brutality in recent years is the simple fact that this nation had (under Tito) committed an unforgivable crime: It had escaped the domination of the Comintern.

To accuse a person or a nation of being "communist" or "Marxist" bears little opprobrium. If one wants to demonize a nation or a political adversary, the current gambit is to identify him with Hitler, with genocide, or with diverse crimes against the human race. This has obviously been the case with Jörg Haider, the leader of the Austrian Patriotic Freedom Party, whose political program includes a vibrant opposition to the anti-patriotic bureaucratic socialism of the European Union. No one would have batted an eyelid if he had been called a communist