

Editorial

Sign or signal

George Bush has made defense a key policy issue in his campaign, with the slogan: Peace Through Strength. Since he has based his campaign upon the Reagan record, he has perforce defended that record on arms reduction; however, recently there are indications that a grouping around Bush is becoming seriously worried that the United States is at the point of conceding world hegemony to the Soviets.

Henry Kissinger has placed himself publicly in this grouping, in a number of recent speeches and articles. Now he has taken this a step further by, in effect, associating himself with the ongoing dialogue between the Soviets and the Bush grouping on the question of Lyndon LaRouche's role in the next administration.

Some week's ago, Italy's Prime Minister Ciriaco De Mita returned from meeting Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachov in Moscow. According to press accounts, he reported that Gorbachov rejected a "Kissinger" proposal that conditions be set on any aid being given to the Soviets by the West, in a package that would include national sovereignty for Poland.

A similar proposal had in fact, been made—but by independent Democratic presidential candidate LaRouche, at a filmed press conference which he held in Berlin. (Clips from this press conference were viewed by American TV audiences during a LaRouche national campaign broadcast on Oct. 31.)

LaRouche proposed that the West should undertake to provide food for the Soviets, conditional upon their freeing Poland and allowing a genuine reunification of the German nation.

Understandably, considering Soviet distress at LaRouche's already large policy influence internationally, Gorbachov appears to have chosen not to directly address LaRouche's remarks. While we had not seen any previous Kissinger speech with precisely that formulation, on Oct. 26, Kissinger came out with essentially the LaRouche proposal, in a policy statement which he claimed to be making on behalf of George Bush's campaign.

Taken in tandem with recent speeches of a similar tough tenor by former Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, who has urged that the United States not continue to be bound by the ABM Treaty, the Kissinger speech is of great interest on its own merits, without regard to its strange "coincidence" with the LaRouche speech.

Kissinger in his speech characterized the current period as an end to the postwar era of foreign policy. He attacked the characterization by the appeasers who point to a Soviet transformation, and ridiculed the notion that Gorbachov has undergone a conversion, and then aptly warned: "I can't predict Gorbachov's intentions. He probably doesn't know himself. . . . It is dangerous to make the foreign policy of a nation dependent on the good will of one individual."

Most significantly, he then cited the Russian drive to expand their empire, citing how in every century, Russian borders have expanded in all directions, as they gobbled up neighboring nations.

Kissinger then suggested that the West seek to contain the Soviets by demanding that these border states be strengthened as a way of containing Soviet expansionism. For the West to rely passively upon the evolution of the Soviet state, would be to "mortgage the future" he said.

Executive Intelligence Review has often opposed Henry Kissinger in the past, and we no doubt will feel called upon to do so again in the future; however, right now we applaud the role that he is playing. Any shift in policy which breaks the drift toward appeasement and the unilateral disarming of the West, is long overdue.

There is, of course, always the possibility that the Kissinger speech is only meant as a signal to the Soviets, to be read in the context of ongoing negotiations. We choose to believe otherwise.

At the very least, we can hope that *if* it is a signal, rather than a sign of an actual policy shift which will occur in a Bush administration, then it is a signal that the policy initiatives of Lyndon LaRouche will be seriously considered by a Bush administration.