

## Editorial

# What's wrong in Washington?

Almost everybody sniffs the fact that there is still a problem in Washington. And it has already become clear that part of the stench is emanating from the State Department, where Alexander Haig is extending the grievous tradition of Henry Kissinger, Cyrus Vance, and Edmund Muskie.

Is there a reason why foreign policy should not be conducted on the basis of pursuing international economic growth, preempting terrorism, and transmitting the best of American technology and education to the postcolonial world? What is the purpose of Haig's bluff toward Eastern Europe and blackmail toward the Western allies?

To invoke the fact that the Council on Foreign Relations traditionally runs the State Department is to beg the question, unless one identifies the policies at stake.

As abundantly documented in their Project 1980s reports under Vance's direction, the Council on Foreign Relations strategists are committed to triggering "limited wars" in the underdeveloped regions, fueled by famine and social chaos, and fueling them in turn. They—most recently, the State Department's Thomas Ferguson—state in so many words that war is one of several means to their goal: exterminating populations. In their view, the Vietnam War succeeded in degrading and polluting the U.S. armed forces, and demoralizing progrowth traditionalists in America, but failed to slaughter enough Vietnamese. In Central America, the extermination is to be more rapid, the deflection of Americans away from a foreign policy of "city-building" more complete.

This is what is causing the rot in Washington—the murderous foreign policy of depopulation being run by General Haig.

There is no long- or even medium-term potential for full U.S. economic recovery unless the markets and skills of the Third World are opened up through industrialization. Conversely, there is no hope for the populations of the underdeveloped sector unless U.S. credit, investment, and techno-

logical knowhow are mobilized. That is the war the United States should be fighting: the war against backwardness and devolution.

At the heart of this challenge is the question of energy. The latterday feudalists who control petroleum supplies have consistently used the oil weapon in what the CFR describes as the effort to preserve "the liberal order" from "dirigists" in Western Europe and Japan. The self-described liberals do not seek to impose population reduction because they believe resources are scarce; they keep resources scarce because nations able to grow and modernize would not tolerate their domination.

The bulk of the budget cuts proposed by the Reagan administration have little to do with economics. They are part of the State Department's *genocidal* policy of crippling the energy, high-technology, and infrastructural buildup required for U.S. national strength and world leadership. Paul Volcker's interest-rate policies have nothing to do with economics. They, too, are an instrument of the State Department's blueprint for eliminating industrial progress.

After World War II, the State Department told U.S. businessmen they had better not invest in the Third World because of the threat of war and communist takeover. Now it is the State Department—through Volcker—that forbids Americans to invest even at home, and—through Stockman—tries to dismantle past investment in nuclear energy, in space technology, in transport, and in labor power.

Contributing Editor Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. has proposed a specific budget reallocation: transferring the \$220 million appropriated for the State Department's Office of Population Affairs, which maps out target populations as the starting point for U.S. foreign policy, to the national nuclear fusion budget, whose expansion would provide both the energy and the resource base for unbridled growth. That would go a long way to solving the problem in Washington.