

## Editorial

# *Two steps backward, one step forward*

It now seems likely that the upcoming Bush-Gorbachov summit will be stalled on disarmament questions, with the Soviets backing off from previous agreements, and increasing their demands on the United States. For example, they now demand linkage of signing of the START treaty to consideration of submarine-launched cruise missiles (SLCMs). The question is, what is the military-strategic position of the world over the medium to long term, and with emphasis upon those things which must be taken into consideration immediately, respecting decisions, political and others, which must be made, because of their long-term effect?

In general, it should be obvious that all of the strategic assessments, overt and possibly covert, around the Bush administration, are incompetent. The Bush administration, and the institutions functioning as part of the Bush administration team, have no comprehension of what is happening in the world.

We cannot say that the Bush administration is dedicated to preserving the United States as it was founded, as a republic, in respect to adversary forces; that is, forces which are adversary to that purpose, and that interest which the United States was founded to represent, as a constitutional republic. Rather, the Bush administration is itself betraying, irrevocably, if it continues the present course, the most fundamental interests of both the United States as such and Western civilization as a whole.

On the other side, the Soviets maintain a commitment to preserving the historic Russian "Third Rome" policy. The Russians are willing to accept a tactical retreat in eastern Europe, in order to regroup their forces, and reorganize their armed forces to incorporate technologies based upon new physical principles, such as radio-frequency devices.

In that light, what the Russians are doing, to whatever degree they are or are not aware of this fact, is that they are copying Lenin's "two steps backward, one step forward." Faced with the fact that they cannot hold certain ground, under present conditions, but also the fact that the Anglo-American financial economic sys-

tem is in a process of collapse, with what that implies, the Russians are retreating to some degree, with a view of moving forward in the future—once the full effect of the Anglo-American financial economic debacle occurs.

In the United States there is a prevailing insanity, that military policy must be shaped around demands of the budget, rather than on the question of the imperatives of national defense. This gives rise to the wishful thinking that the Soviets are no longer an enemy.

What the military imperative implies, is a buildup of Western economies, to enable them to carry the necessary defense burden. In the United States this means scrapping the policy of the past 25 years, scrapping the rock-drug-sex counterculture, scrapping monetarism, scrapping the hideous cult of free trade, and so forth. It means going to a development policy in the developing nations. That is, a policy of high-technology, scientific, and technological development. It means scrapping so-called environmentalism, or at least the cult form in which it's rolling around Reilly's Environmental Protection Agency today.

There are two ways of looking at military technology: One is the development of the most advanced military technologies, such as those implied by the original LaRouche policy for a Strategic Defense Initiative. From such a course of investment, productivity spin-offs into the general economy would essentially make the program self-financing.

The other approach, assuming a dominant pacifist mood in policy circles because of fear of offending the Soviets, at the minimum we must defend the military logistical potentials of the economy to allow rapid rearmament. This means a surge of industrial activity and energy-dense, capital-intense investment per capita, and large-scale infrastructure investment and investment in the development of the machine-tool industry. Unfortunately, the Bush administration is wedded to Maggie Thatcher's lame duck free-market economics, just as they are blindsided about the reality of Soviet policy.