Editorial

For a 'global technological revolution'

The most fundamental strategic issue now being fought out in the fiercest terms imaginable is the question of whether, and in what form, the world will have a cultural-technological revolution in the decades ahead.

On Jan. 13 Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko firmly presented a policy opposed to a worldwide scientific-technological revolution on Soviet national television: "We know the handwriting of the American administration, and we are familiar with the situation in the United States. Therefore I wish to firmly underline that a policy of conducting scientific research work with the aim of creating a large-scale missile-defense system does not withstand criticism, neither politically nor morally. It is vulnerable, it must be rejected." The top political leadership of the Soviet Union have warned against certain "dangerous" ideological elements in the United States who wish to trick and induce the Russians into a joint scientific-technological revolution around sharing anti-missile beam technologies.

From the U.S. side, Ronald Reagan on Jan. 21 in his inaugural address personally enunciated a policy for a new technological revolution in the following terms: "From new freedom will spring new opportunities for growth, a more productive, fulfilled and united people, and a stronger America that will lead the technological revolution, and also open its mind, heart and soul to the treasures of literature, music and poetry, and the values of faith, courage, and love."

Three days after the Reagan speech, the West German daily *Die Welt* in a remarkable lead editorial presented the question from a European standpoint: "The Americans face a long, complicated and tiresome, maybe sometimes not even successful process of education which can lift the enemy to their own level of ethics. Can an indeologically-petrified colossus [like the U.S.S.R.] be induced to sacrifice its own stubbornness for the sake of conclusions to be drawn from modern technology?"

Readers of Executive Intelligence Review will rec-

ognize the substance of the issue now being debated as The LaRouche Doctrine, first published as the cover story of this journal on April 17, 1984. In place of the fatalistic nihilism that World War III is inevitable, LaRouche argues that there exists a basis for a joint agreement among the superpowers through the joint research and application of "new physical principles." In short, cultural optimism revolves for a century to come around the universal tasks of a defensive shield for all peoples against nuclear missiles, the exploration of space, and the ending of economic backwardness in the developing sector.

It is ironic that the Russian leadership, which has heretofore pompously intoned dogmas about their ideological commitment to a "scientific and technological revolution" should now be publicly campaigning against loosening the fetters of scientific and technological progress. The decayed priest-caste structure of Mother Russia's orthodoxy, which struggled against scientific development in Russia during the 18th and 19th centuries, is once again rearing its ugly head.

There does exist another tradition in the Soviet Union. Lyndon LaRouche's policy for unleashing a worldwide scientific-cultural renaissance by his own account was inspired by great principles embedded in the works of the Gottfried W. Leibniz (1648-1716). Not only were America's founding fathers like Benjamin Franklin avid Leibnizians, but so, too, were the scientific currents associated with the St. Petersburg Scientific Academy, founded according to the plan Leibniz gave to Peter the Great in 1712.

As both Lyndon LaRouche and his wife Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the founder of the Schiller Institute, have repeatedly emphasized, for mankind to survive these perilous times we need nothing less than to "spark off" the beginnings of a worldwide scientific-cultural renaissance in 1985. Not merely the "whether," but more emphatically the "content" of that scientific-cultural revolution is the number one strategic issue of our age.

64 National EIR February 5, 1985