Editorial

Who needs Henry?

Some gullible individuals may have breathed a sigh of relief to notice that Henry Kissinger seems to have disappeared from public view. Alas! His spirit still haunts the U.S. government. Ironically, like the good prophet Elijah in the Jewish Passover ceremony, for whom a chair is always left vacant, the evil Kissinger was present in spirit, if not body, during the recent negotiations in Washington, to prepare for the June Bush/Gorbachov summit.

The summit as now scheduled will occur at the beginning of June, when the rest of the world will be commemorating the brave victims of the Tiananmen Square massacre, which, of course, Bush now implicitly follows Kissinger in supporting. Indeed, there is nothing different in George Bush's policy than Kissinger's policy over the past three or four decades. We have a Kissinger administration, not a Bush administration; we have just to look at the Soviet policy aspect of this, or the European policy, to confirm the unfortunate truth that the present administration in Washington is a Kissinger administration, no matter where Kissinger is.

By putting forward the date of the summit, rather than delaying it, Bush gave the world a signal that he was giving Czar Mikhail carte blanche in Lithuania. What George is doing to Lithuania is not only what Neville Chamberlain did to Czechoslovakia back in 1938 (and both George and Neville call this a concession for the sake of peace); but George is doing to Lithuania, together with the British, of course, exactly what Kissinger's admired Castlereagh, the foreign minister back then in 1815, did to Poland at the Congress of Vienna.

It was Neville Chamberlain and his friends in 1938, who by their betrayal of Czechoslovakia ensured World War II. If we allow the modern "Czechoslovakia," the Baltic nations, to go down for the sake of policy, as Chamberlain let Czechoslovakia go down for the sake of policy, we unleash something which may be—and probably will be—irreversible.

In one respect it is incorrect to compare the current Bush administration with that of Britain's Neville Chamberlain, or even with the Reagan administration of 1982-83. The present gang is far more stupid; indeed, they verge upon psychosis. When trying to understand the present debacle of Bush's foreign and domestic policy—as in the case of the Clean Air Act—it is important to bear this in mind.

One reason for this is the greater homogeneity which has been achieved within the Establishment, to-day, than under Reagan, where a conflict over ideas was tolerated, even if its resolution was in terms of finding a lowest common denominator. Today, no disagreement with the prevailing line is tolerated.

Anyone who wishes to be heard or influential, or to maintain a foothold or position within the Establishment, must not be caught or overheard thinking in terms which are at variance with the prevailing line. Such an individual must adapt himself or herself to a world view which is axiomatically consistent with the assumptions of George Bush, a man who thinks that the rise to the presidency of the United States of America is synonymous with liberation from the compulsion to eat broccoli.

U.S. policy is presently based upon bluff and bluster; it is the policy of a bully—in other words, the policy of Kissinger. And like the typical bully, the U.S. attacks its allies and appeases its enemy.

In the face of a deepening economic crisis, and despite the fact that the Soviets have now virtually dropped the charade of glasnost, Bush is trying to maintain policies which can only lead the United States into a worse and worse position.

Bush is desperately trying to maintain the appearance that he is the man in charge, by denying reality, and pretending that he is in control. To maintain this fiction, he must still all dissent. Thus Lyndon LaRouche and his associates remain in prison.

It is still not too late to reverse the descent into the abyss. Merely by releasing LaRouche from prison, a major step forward will have been taken. Merely his presence on the scene, as a factor with which the adminstration is forced to contend, will force the consideration of reality back into the fantasy-ridden environment of Washington.

EIR April 20, 1990 National 72