

that position, and join with these HMOs, to literally mistreat, or maltreat patients.

We have to say: We will not work for the HMOs, we will not do anything for the HMOs. We will provide care for the patient, even if we do not get paid for it. *But we must take the stand.*

And I guarantee you, the public out there will support a doctor to move away from the managed-care groups. I do not have to tell you—it's published all the time in the paper, of various mishaps with HMOs, where people want certain treatment, the HMO said, "No, it's not covered by our plan," and the people who are making those decisions—maybe they are very lucky if they had graduated from high school. Yet, they are making major medical decisions, for your health care. . . .

I have to blame the public. It is your right; your health care is what determines whether you are rich or poor. If you are unhealthy, you will never be rich. If you are healthy, there is always the possibility to get rich.

Therefore, it is time that you, as a public, march, take up health care as an issue. Tell them: "This is our lives. We are going to make the determination as to *how* health care is delivered in this country, when it's delivered, to whom it's delivered, and not left up to these corporate executives."

I guarantee you, the medical profession will back you as a general public, to demand the best health care. As I've always said, and I will still maintain, the wealth of any country is solely dependent on the health of all of its inhabitants. If the United States wants to continue as the leading wealthy nation, then it better wake up, and recognize that its health care is far behind those of other countries which are less wealthy.

Therefore, it's about time attention is paid to the health-care delivery system in this country. And the United States government must take that lead. If the government does not wish to take the lead, then you, as a people, the public, and the medical profession, must take that lead, and demand that health care be the Number One Important Question and Issue which must be addressed in this country, not tomorrow, but today, if not yesterday.

I think it behooves you. People march for other issues. You've got to march for these issues. And, if your representatives do not want to understand what this is all about, then you have that right, to vote that person out of power.

Because after all, what is a government's function? If the traditional function of government, is not to make sure that you are healthy, that you are protected, and that there is reasonable housing and good education, then there is no need for government. You might as well govern yourself.

Therefore, it becomes important that you, as a people, take it upon yourself to demand this type of attendance to the health-care industry, and your health-care from your government.

Thank you very much.

## NMD Test Failure Should Buy Time for Competent Decision

by Carl Osgood and Jeffrey Steinberg

At 1:39 a.m. on July 8, a dejected Lt. Gen. Ronald Kadish, director of the Ballistic Missile Defense Office, appeared before reporters in the Pentagon briefing room to report that the much anticipated intercept test of the National Missile Defense system had failed. He said that what was known at that time, was that the interceptor vehicle, known as the exo-atmospheric kill vehicle, had failed to separate from the booster rocket because of a failure within the booster. As a result, the intercept phase of the test never took place.

According to Kadish, and subsequent statements put out by the Pentagon, what happened that night went something like this: The test began when a modified Minuteman missile, with a target warhead and a balloon decoy, was launched from Vandenberg Air Force Base at 12:19 a.m. EDT. Twenty minutes later, the booster rocket, also a modified Minuteman missile, was launched from Kwajalein Atoll, about 4,300 miles away in the Pacific Ocean. According to program officials, the first stage of the booster successfully separated, but then the launch vehicle began to tumble slowly after an energy management maneuver designed to keep it within the confines of the test range, failed. The kill vehicle never received the signal that the second-stage rocket motor had completed its burn. That signal is required in order for the kill vehicle to separate and carry out its intercept function. A July 8 Pentagon statement emphasized that all of the kill vehicle's systems were operating "as designed" up to the moment when separation was to occur.

Kadish went to great lengths to explain that the booster that failed, was not the booster that will be used in the operational system, and therefore its failure should not have a great effect on the program. The Minuteman boosters are, as Kadish said, "surrogates" for the real booster, which is still under development (and eight months behind schedule). "The thing we were hoping to get out of this," Kadish explained, "was much more information on the interceptor portion of it." The program now has produced one successful intercept in three tries, the other failure occurring only five seconds before intercept, when the cryogenic cooling system for the interceptor's infrared seeker failed.

The real question is, how much effect this test failure has on the decision-making time-line for building the system. Unlike most Pentagon weapons programs, development and construction of the infrastructure for the operational system are proceeding in parallel, a high-risk approach which is driven largely by the conclusions of the Rumsfeld Commission, which predicted, in its 1998 report, that North Korea would have an operational ballistic missile capable of hitting the United States by 2005. The first decision point coming up later this year, is when to start construction of the x-band radar facility on Shemya Island, at the end of the Aleutians chain in Alaska.

Some top Pentagon officials are acting as if the test failure doesn't amount to much. After all, the failure occurred in a component that won't be part of the final system. Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics Jacques Gansler, standing alongside Kadish, declared, "The rest of the system now has successfully worked twice," although the interceptor only worked once, so far. "So, in a sense," he said, "we've tested the major elements of this system sufficiently to say that the design is probably the one that's pretty solid."

### **Growing Institutional Reserve**

Other top Administration officials, however, have shown a bit more reserve. Secretary of Defense William Cohen, speaking to reporters while on his way to Beijing on July 10, said, "I would reserve a judgment" on making a decision recommendation to the President, "until I get all the way through the analysis." National Security Adviser Sandy Berger, appearing on CBS's "Face the Nation" the day before, said, "The failure of the test . . . is important in assessing how far along this system is technologically."

The *New York Times*, perhaps reflecting a growing institutional consensus, editorialized that the failed test was the "clinching argument" that a decision should be put off until the new Administration comes into office next January. The editorial noted the "interesting offers" of a cooperative system of defense against limited missile attack, coming from Russian President Vladimir Putin, and further noted that the North Koreans are negotiating, apparently in good faith, curbing any further missile tests. None of the other states said to be threats to the United States are anywhere near having such long-range missiles available by 2005. "That leaves no compelling reason for ordering construction other than the perception that doing so might shield Al Gore from Republican attack. Partisan political considerations should not drive such an important defense decision," the *Times* concluded.

Sources close to the Joint Chiefs of Staff have additionally informed *EIR* that the current system design, with an arsenal of fixed anti-missile missiles in Alaska, is not considered viable, although some of the component elements of

the system, including the radar, detection, and advanced computers, are compatible with more sophisticated systems, relying on anti-missile weapons based on "new physical principles."

These sources emphasize that it is not at all unhealthy that a serious debate on the future of missile defense is now under way, and that the debate is international in scope, involving America's European NATO allies, Russia, China, and other leading nations of the Asia-Pacific region.

The latest test failure should, hopefully, ensure that the decision on deployment is postponed, that the fixation on the North Korean threat is tempered by the recent breakthrough summit between the two Koreas, and that the full scope of strategic and technological issues that must be addressed in deploying any competent system that could contribute, rather than detract from world peace and stability, are fully debated. The Summer 2000 issue of *21st Century Science & Technology* magazine will feature an article, "In Defense of Strategy," by Lyndon LaRouche, the intellectual author of President Ronald Reagan's original Strategic Defense Initiative, on current prospects for a comprehensive and competent global shield against offensive nuclear weapons, that is certain to add to the debate.

For previews and  
information on  
LaRouche publications:

## **Visit EIR's Internet Website!**

- Highlights of current issues of EIR
- Pieces by Lyndon LaRouche
- Every week: transcript and audio of the latest **EIR Talks** radio interview.

<http://www.larouchepub.com>

e-mail: [larouche@larouchepub.com](mailto:larouche@larouchepub.com)