

LaRouche joins battle to shape next President's policies

Independent presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche, in an open letter released on Sept. 19, challenged the ongoing bid by Henry Kissinger and other policymaking elites to shape the program of the next administration. "During the coming four years, beginning 1989," he writes, "the United States will be confronted with the worst complex of crises during this century. We require, more than at any time during the postwar period to date, either a President who is strong in the sense of a clear comprehension of each of these crises, or a presidency based on a suitable array of leading advisers immediately proximate to the President."

At a press conference on Sept. 12, Republican presidential nominee George Bush had announced that he is taking on Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski as co-chairmen of his new advisory panel on strategic issues.

In the Sept. 19 issue of *Newsweek*, Kissinger addressed a memorandum to the next President, warning of the crises to come. Many Western leaders, he said, "paint an idyllic picture in which change will occur thanks to a new breed of communist leader," to the effect that, "If the democracies persist in relying upon only the most optimistic assumptions about the future, the present tranquility will be just the calm before the storm."

While LaRouche reports that he would concur with the gist of Kissinger's warnings about Mikhail Gorbachov's so-called *glasnost*, and some of his arguments concerning the challenge facing NATO, that is where the similarity between his views and Kissinger's ends.

"My historical standpoint for U.S. foreign policy today," LaRouche writes, "is the conception of 'community of principle among sovereign nation-state republics,' as argued by U.S. Secretary of State John Quincy Adams, respecting both the U.S. rejection of Canning's proposed treaty and the adop-

tion, and future prospects for implementation of the 1823 Monroe Doctrine, instead. I see Argentine minister Drago's Corollary to that Doctrine as a correct reading of the intent of the combined U.S. Declaration of Independence and Federal Constitution, and the 'Roosevelt Corollary' as a tragic error.

"Dr. Kissinger has adopted the contrary view, that of Lord Castlereagh and Prince Metternich, and has practiced that view in his public life since the issuance of his *A World Restored*.

"Those differences characterized Dr. Kissinger's implementation of Pugwash Conference themes of Soviet conciliation during the past. In that connection, I have often been perplexed, how much of Dr. Kissinger's detente and arms-control policies he owed to Winston Churchill's outlook, or Bertrand Russell's. Today, it appears, his standpoint is a Churchillian reflex. Hence, today, just as many of us became anti-Nazi allies of Churchill during the period of the last world war, to that degree Dr. Kissinger's and my own present views, on some leading dangers in the current Soviet relations, tend to converge to at least a significant degree."

LaRouche explains that the West's policy-shaping establishments are presently divided among three principal tendencies.

"There are those who wish a 'New Yalta' form of global power-sharing with Moscow to go forward at, at least, the pace it has moved forward during the second Reagan administration. Opposite, are those traditional nationalists of Western nations, whose standpoint I share, who oppose 'New Yalta' arrangements, and who desire to restore our commitments to our allies in Europe and Asia, and our allies and other friends among developing nations generally. In between these two, there is the large establishment current within which Dr. Kissinger is situated, those who wish to

strike a balance between global power-sharing with Moscow and the maintenance of a credible Western deterrent.

"It were probable that if Mr. Dukakis were the next President, an all-out 'New Yalta' accommodation would prevail over the coming four years. If Mr. Bush, the policy-shaping combination would reflect a combination of the traditional nationalists and Mr. Kissinger's allies within the 'deterrence' faction. The latter outcome seems presently the more likely, if uncertain one. If Mr. Bush were elected, the issues of party are transcended by bipartisanship in shaping of foreign and strategic policies. Hence, the importance to our future of the policy-debate, now ongoing on both sides of the Atlantic, between the traditionalists and the deterrence currents."

'Community of principle'

Key to the difference between the approaches of LaRouche and Kissinger, is Kissinger's Metternichean notion of the "balance of power." It was this concept that defined Kissinger's role in creating the era of "détente," with the included SALT and ABM treaties. It further determined Kissinger's on-again-off-again attitude toward the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), which he views as a bargaining chip in the game of crisis management, in arms control negotiations with Moscow.

LaRouche, on the contrary, insists upon John Quincy Adams's doctrine of the "community of principle" among nations. "The principal challenge," he writes, "which will determine whether the next Presidency is a successful one, or a tragic failure, is the way in which the U.S. government acts respecting matters which determine the stability, strength, and mutual security within an array of sovereign nation-states treated as the kind of community of principle which Adams foresaw for the independent republics of this hemisphere.

"Dr. Kissinger appears not to understand what is signified by such a community of principle. . . .

"Insofar as Dr. Kissinger attaches the quality of rightness to the philosophical standpoint of Metternich and Castlereagh, his axiomatic attachment to that sort of 'central European' viewpoint, prevents him from grasping the underlying intent of the founding of our republic. . . .

"To the degree he recognizes views such as those of Franklin and John Quincy Adams to exist, he must tend to regard those as plain errors of opinion and practice, which he must hope we have outgrown. So, he stated in his May 1982 address to London's Chatham House, in defending the wartime views of Winston Churchill, against the traditionally American attitudes toward the postwar developing sector expressed by President Franklin Roosevelt.

"I acquired my own present view of the foreign-policy implications of our Constitution in the China-Burma-India theater, during the last world war. I witnessed the conditions of the peoples of Asia with disgust: not merely terrible privation, but witnessed also a horrifying want of respect for the sacredness of individual human life, especially the lives of

the illiterate poor. In that setting, I saw, first hand, the role of international communism, and hated it.

"It appeared plain to me then, that the future security of the United States, and this planet as a whole, required that the United States put its weight in world affairs behind the rights of all peoples to aspire to and attain the same goals as our republic's founders, and to enjoy access to the kinds of benefits of scientific and technological progress which Washington's U.S. Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton named 'the American System of political-economy.' Dr. Kissinger has repeatedly, consistently expressed a contrary view.

"There lies the axiomatic root of the differences which have existed between Dr. Kissinger and me up to this point. In respect to the importance of the policy-shaping debates now ongoing, it is important, that even if he can not be won over to my point of view in this matter, he and his friends must understand our differences in these terms of reference, and that that characteristic of the differences between his numerous co-thinkers and the traditionalists be made known to the process of shaping the policies of the next President."

What Kissinger ignores

The fate of the next presidency, and perhaps of our republic, too, LaRouche writes, will depend on whether the next President attacks the crises facing us by changing the basic assumptions that have shaped U.S. policy during the 30 years or so since the 1958 Pugwash Conferences, or whether he adopts band-aid measures that leave the causes for the crises untouched. If the faulty assumptions which Kissinger insists upon in global strategy, economic policy, and cultural trends are not abandoned, we are facing the loss of much more than the relative strategic economic strength of the United States as such; the planet will be plunged into a New Dark Age.

In particular, Kissinger's discussion fails to consider the most immediate crisis to confront the next President: global financial collapse. A sweeping reorganization of the international monetary system will be required, akin to the successful reorganization of a manufacturing firm in Chapter 11. This implies the transformation of present central banking arrangements, to create national banking of the sort projected by George Washington's administration.

"Under conditions of acute financial crisis," LaRouche writes, "the next President has at his disposal a popular desperation to such effect that sweeping institutional reforms of this sort become feasible ones. He must be prepared to act to such effect at the moment this state of perceived crisis exists." The reorganization will provide the basis for ensuring an adequate defense, and for dealing with the most deadly feature of the economic crisis, the global food shortage.

"No Presidency of the postwar period has faced a complex of crises as profound and ominous as those before us now," LaRouche concludes. "Let us shape the choice and composition of the next presidency accordingly."