

## Editorial

### *Kissinger versus LaRouche (again)*

Henry Kissinger, who noticed a few months back that Ibero-America can't pay its debt, has now supposedly discovered that the Strategic Defense Initiative is a dandy thing. And he's waddling around Europe selling himself as the champion and ultimate dealmaker for the SDI. Given his record on the subject of strategic arms, he ought to be made—as the old Italian proverb goes—“as welcome as a dog in church.”

Henry's version of the SDI is as phony as his solution for the debt of our Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking neighbors in the Western hemisphere. We proved on these pages recently that the Kissinger debt proposal is not new. Neither is his strategic doctrine. The man who enforced MAD (Mutually Assured Destruction) as the military doctrine of the United States, and on that basis bargained away our anti-missile defense potential to the Soviets in a series of treasonous treaties, has not renounced MADness.

In fact, some Italians who witnessed Henry in action in Venice recently conjectured, “He's out to steal the SDI.” Along with his British stringpullers. The latter are demanding a “special relationship” with the United States in development of SDI technologies, which would freeze out the continental NATO allies and allow the U.K. to go on being the privileged leak point to Moscow of American technological advances.

The Thatcher government has demanded of Washington, with “vigorous insistence” (*Times* of London) “a guarantee of two-way technology flow as a condition for British participation” in SDI.

The actual key to the SDI is not the gadgetry involved, but the doctrine. This was provided by its intellectual author, *EIR* founder and contributing editor Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr, who publicly advocated in Washington, in February of 1982, the shift in U.S. strategic doctrine adopted by President Reagan in his famous March 23, 1983 address. LaRouche called for a shift to Mutually Assured Survival, based on the adoption by both superpowers of new defensive weaponry, based on new physical principles, which would make nuclear missiles impotent and obsolete.

This, LaRouche stressed, would reverse the more than two decades of devastation of the Western industrial economies which had been enforced by the nuclear terror of MAD. Most importantly, this change in military doctrine would restore the “technological optimism” which Kissinger's masters in the British and Swiss oligarchy were determined to destroy by MAD.

Have Kissinger & associates had a change in heart, now that they are “pro-SDI”? Not on your life. On Sept. 7, Kissinger penned another of his syndicated columns, calling for limitation of the SDI to point defense. That means: Forget about protecting cities and populations as a primary goal, and therefore, forget about ending the reign of nuclear terror against technological progress.

On Sept. 13, Kissinger received the formal endorsement of Lt.-Gen. Daniel P. Graham, who on that date kicked off the formation of a misnamed “Coalition for the Strategic Defense Initiative.” The coalition is intended as a vehicle to subvert the SDI and the U.S. ASAT capability, as is made clear by the statement of its executive director, Richard Sellers (Graham is chairman). Announcing the formation of the committee, which boasts some 69 congressional sponsors, Sellers admitted that the outfit is ready to give up the SDI for a deal with the Soviets: “Our intelligence indicates that there is support in the administration for accepting Gorbachov's offer—a land-based Soviet missile reduction in exchange for our dropping any space-based project.”

What is needed is more of exactly the kind of decisive action that President Reagan took on Sept. 13, when he called the Soviets' bluff and went ahead with the scheduled test of the U.S. anti-satellite weapon (ASAT), demonstrating that the United States will not be cowed into submission by Soviet threats of retaliation. Now the administration needs to make it equally clear that it will not be intimidated by the British (or, Kissinger) version of the SDI, limited to “point defense” and ready to be bargained away at Geneva. The simple fact is that either the U.S. will adopt LaRouche's SDI—or none at all.