

**Italian Catholic Daily:
"LaRouche The Third Man"**

The following article appeared Sept. 9 in the nationally circulated Italian Catholic newspaper Avvenire. The article was headlined "A Third Man in the Challenge Between Ford and Carter; It Is LaRouche, Leader of the Labor Party."

WASHINGTON, D.C., Sept. 8 (NSIPS) — The American electoral campaign is not only a duel between Ford and Carter. In several states, as after all has happened in all the presidential elections, a third party will be running.

This time, however, there is a third party that is more combative and branched out than the local grouplets that were present in the past; it certainly is different from the conservative party that had a certain success in the "deep south" at the time of the Alabama Governor, George Wallace. It is a self-des-

cribed Marxist party, the U.S. Labor Party, and it launches Lyndon LaRouche, a 52-year-old economist and university professor, as its presidential candidate.

According to LaRouche, the next presidential elections will be a private affair between himself and Ford, since Carter "has no credibility" as a political figure. Although the Democratic Party seems stronger than this summary judgment might show, the USLP has made a relevant organizing effort in the last months, as shown by the fact that it will be able to present its candidates in nearly one half of the States of the Union.

On the wave of the decisions made at the conference of the Non-Aligned countries, which demand a world debt moratoria of the Third World against the industrialized countries, LaRouche and his people, who for a long time have theorized on the need for a "New World Economic Order," are preparing themselves for the Labor Party convention (held on September 21 in Washington) to put in motion an electoral machine which, they state, consists of 1,800 full time activists and over 13,000 sympathizers.

NEW SOLIDARITY INTERNATIONAL PRESS SERVICE

NSIPS EXCLUSIVE REPORT



Soviets Warn Ford To Curb Kissinger

Sept. 10 (NSIPS) — The Soviet Union has sharply criticized President Ford for the first time in months, because of Ford's hesitation to terminate Henry Kissinger's career in foreign policy and the immediate war threat his continuing career presents. While daily articles in the Soviet press denounce Kissinger's attempted African shuttle diplomacy as extremely dangerous and warn of a Middle East blow-up, Pravda's leading commentator Vitalii Korionov warned specifically against "indulging" the enemies of detente. Castigating Ford directly for his "hard line" National Guard speech, Pravda evinced "surprise and dismay" at Ford's conduct — whereas the Soviet Union has repeatedly greeted Ford's official stand in favor of a new Strategic Arms agreement and a Middle East settlement to be negotiated at Geneva.

Focusing on the urgency of the Soviets' appeal to Ford to stop wavering, a major article on Lebanon appeared in Pravda Sept. 8, calling for a negotiated settlement to the Lebanese war involving "reasonable compromise." Far from being a "reversal" of Soviet support for the Lebanese left and Palestinian forces in Lebanon, as CBS national TV reports characterized it, the Pravda article constitutes another appeal to sane forces to put an end to Kissinger's war-making potential in the area.

Pravda Attacks Ford's Position Of Strength Statements

The following is excerpted from the "International Week" column in Pravda, Sept. 5.

The struggle for peace and security of peoples is the rudder of the foreign policy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet government....

The importance of further unification of efforts of all advocates of peace and their joint actions, is all the more clear, because the pendulum of the arms race... continues to swing...

(Pravda's commentator, Boris Orekhav, then outlines major U.S. weapons expansion plans.)

There are facts, before which no one to whom peace on earth, the security of peoples and the life of future generations is dear can keep silent. The conscience of humanity demands: the arms race must be stopped. Time does not sit still, as more and more people of good will understand, and these people are awaiting practical steps to stop this ruinous race, on the part of state and government leaders.

So much the greater is the surprise and dismay caused by U.S. President Gerald Ford's statement a few days ago to the National Guard association: "We are convinced that the best guarantee of peace is military might, which causes respect all over the world," said the speaker. The American president considers it a great service rendered by the present Washington administration that it opposes reduction of U.S. military expenditures, which, as is known, are incredibly high and this year amount to the gigantic sum of \$112.3 billion.

"Combat readiness preserves peace — weakness attracts war"; "our policy of defense on the basis of 'total forces' " — with these and like statements, Ford's speech abounded. This lexicon recalls the notorious policy "from positions of strength," which went bankrupt in its time and was rejected by life itself.

It needs no special proof to say that the above-cited statements ... are totally out of tune with the general tendency now ruling in international relations — the tendency to peace and consolidate peaceful coexistence, for which leading state leaders are now working. The views stated by the president are blatantly contradictory to the policy of improving Soviet-American relations and with the agreements achieved in this direction, on the implementation of which peoples are counting. They contradict the aspirations of millions of people who have welcomed the policy of detente, strengthening of peace, and international security.

It is often asserted abroad that the statements of U.S. officials

can be explained in terms of conjunctural considerations related to the electoral campaign. But elections are elections and policy is policy. And it is therefore impossible to justify by the electoral campaign, statements which run counter to the policy of international detente and the improvement of relations among countries.

Pravda:

“Reasonable Compromise” For Mideast Peace

What follows are excerpts from an article in the Soviet Communist Party daily Pravda of Sept. 8, entitled “To Find a Way Out of the Lebanese Deadlock.” The article, which urges “a political solution” of the Lebanese crisis “on the basis of reasonable compromise” is signed Observor, a signal that the commentary originated with top Soviet leadership:

The situation in Lebanon remains very tense; each day shots thunder there, and people are losing their lives. It is noteworthy, moreover, that in recent days, the political activity around the Lebanese has markedly increased. Two proposals, for example, have been put forward at the same time, both for holding an inter-Arab conference on a summit level. One provides for the convocation of such a conference with limited, the other with broad, attendance, including the representatives of all Arab states. The plenipotentiary of the League of Arab Countries in Lebanon declared that it has worked out a ‘peace plan,’ which is now being discussed by the conflicting sides.

According to reports in the Beirut press, this plan provides for a cease fire throughout the country, the withdrawal of warring units from the ‘hot regions’ and the stationing of pan-Arab troops there, the fulfillment of the earlier concluded Lebanese-Palestinian agreements, and the partial withdrawal of the Syrian troops from Lebanon. The papers also write on the renewal of direct or indirect (through mediators) contacts between the different groupings, on meetings between Syrian and Palestinian representatives, and on the visit to direct (through mediators) contacts between the different groupings, on meetings between Syrian and Palestinian representatives. and on the visit to Damascus by the newly elected President of Lebanon, E. Sarkis, who is supposed to assume his position on Sept. 23....”

Many facts show that the leaders of the rightwing groups have not given up on achieving their stated goals by military force. What these goals are and by what methods they are being realized can be judged even just by cruel violence which was committed after the fall of the largest Palestinian camp Tel Zaatar, last month....”

The Lebanon tangle is actually woven out of several conflicts at once. There are social-political and religious contradictions and the contradiction between the reactionary forces and the national-patriotic forces acting together with the Palestinian resistance movement. The outbreak of these contradictions, taking the character of a prolonged military conflict, was provoked by foreign imperialist circles and their allies who strive to use the rightwing in Lebanon to finish off the Palestinian Resistance Movement (PRM) and the Arab progressive organizations who are supporting it, and to liquidate the PRM as an independent factor in the struggle against the Israeli aggressor.

The development of the crisis is taking place with open interference by imperialist agencies, some Western states and Israel. As the French (news daily) Le Monde writes, “The civil war in Lebanon is not and never was a purely internal affair.” Tel Aviv does not even hide any longer that they are not at all

sideline observers, but active participants in the Lebanese crisis. Israeli television has acknowledged that the navy patrol forces of Israel are committing pirate raids off Lebanon, confiscating arms sent to the ports of Saida and Tyre for the Left and Palestinian forces. As for ships headed for Junieh, nobody is harrassing them, although they include carrying arms form Israel.

The correspondent of the American paper “Christian Science Monitor” quotes interesting statements by a rightwing Lebanese: “In the first months we did not know where our next bullet would come from. Now some countries give us arms we need without payment.” When asked why Israel participates in the arms deliveries, he answered: “This is completely clear. The Israelis are satisfied. We do the job for them.”

The matter is not limited to the delivery of war supplies and technology. From England and France, mercenaries are sent for the “rightist armies” of Lebanon; the same “gentlemen of fortune” who committed murder on Angolan soil appeared. The interference by imperialist, above all American and Israeli, circles in Lebanese affairs is such an obvious fact that nobody disputes it any longer.

The situation is further complicated by inter-Arab contradictions, which have been transplanted onto Lebanese soil. Many observers think that direct financial and military support for the rightwing Lebanese groups are coming from a number of Arab countries, such as Saudi Arabia. Such a conclusion, all the more so because it is based on facts, is entirely logical: the reactionary Arab circles are not all interested in a strengthening of the Lebanese patriotic organizations and the Palestinian movement since they are “too left” from the standpoint of the Arab conservative regimes. . . .

The situation is also complicated by the disruption of coordination of activities of the anti-imperialist, anti-Israeli forces in the Arab east — even those who for a long time were considered natural allies and who objectively and in reality are, since their national interests are violated by Israel, which is backed by imperialism and Zionism. The negative consequences of such a split have very harmfully affected the Lebanese events.

Such facts include, for example, the rupture of cooperation between Damascus and the PLO. It will be recalled that, for a long time, the Syrian government and the PLO acted jointly on many questions. Even last year they concluded an agreement on the creation of a united military-political leadership. The representatives of Syria and the PLO mediated between the conflicting parties in Lebanon in the first phase of the crisis in that country.

Then this cooperation, tempered in the joint struggle against Israeli aggression, was broken. Whatever considerations may have guided Damascus to send its troops into Lebanon, this decision turned against the Palestinian movement. It allowed the right wing to deal hardfelt blows to the Palestinians and the Lebanese national patriotic forces. It is clear why the Lebanese progressive organizations and the PLO, and many countries of the Arab, but not only the Arab, world demand withdrawal of Syrian units from the country.

It is also clear why imperialist agencies not only use, but provoke in every way possible the Syrian-Palestinian differences, and strive to drive a wedge between the PLO, Syria and the national-patriotic forces. The West and Tel Aviv see this as a real possibility to weaken both the Palestinian resistance movement and Syria. The Israeli paper ‘Jerusalem Post’ openly wrote that, in Israel’s opinion, the situation in Lebanon guarantees certain very definite benefits, since the PLO and Syria are clashing with each other.

It is now clear to everybody that the only real winners in the

bloodbath on Lebanese soil are the ruling circles of Israel and their supporters. The disunification and depletion of the anti-imperialist forces in internecine quarrels, and their involvement in a prolonged fight among themselves distracts the Arabs from the struggle for the liquidation of the consequences of the 1967 Israeli aggression and opens up large opportunities to dictate to them various plans of a partial settlement for the Arab-Israeli conflict and a continuation of the Israeli occupation of Arab soil, which satisfies the West and Tel Aviv. The restoration of the broken cooperation of Syria with the PLO and the Lebanese national patriotic organizations would not only eliminate many obstacles in the way of a normalization of the situation in Lebanon, but would also help strengthen the Arab front of struggle against Israeli aggression and the expansionist plans of imperialism, for guaranteeing a just peace in the Mideast.

Today, when plans to stop the ongoing bloody conflict in Lebanon are under discussion, the cooperation of all progressive forces is especially necessary, so that these plans do not turn against them. It is clear that after 17 months of fight a lot of mutual distrust has accumulated among the fighting parties. But at the same time, these difficult months have also shown that the conflict can not be solved on a military path.

The only way to restore peaceful life is a political solution on the basis of a reasonable compromise. But settlement must not be permitted to take place at the cost of infringing on the rights of the Palestinians or without considering the legitimate demands of the Lebanese national patriotic forces. Maneuvers in this direction by some rightwing leaders are already underway. Onslaughts of this sort can only lead to a further prolongation of the bloodbath, just as can attempts to reject automatically all peace proposals as some-ultra-leftist elements within the Palestinian movement and the front of patriotic forces do. As Lebanese Prime Minister R. Karame has declared, "All parties must now direct their efforts towards elimination of the differences through a dialogue in the interest of peace."

In spite of the complexity of the situation and the diversity of forces involved in the conflict, it can doubtlessly be solved in a peaceful, democratic fashion. The Lebanese must do this themselves without any outside pressure, in the interest of maintaining the national independence and the territorial unity of their country. For this it is important that all anti-imperialist and genuinely patriotic forces come out of the crisis not weaker but much more consolidated. The Soviet Union has repeatedly declared that it advocates precisely this sort of settlement of the Lebanese conflict.

All those truly interested in a normalization of the situation in Lebanon must apply maximum efforts, so that the hope for peace in this country becomes a reality.

Pravda On Detente:

"Policy Dictated By Reason"

The following article entitled "A Policy Dictated by Reason," appeared under the byline of political observer Vitalli Korionov in the Soviet party newspaper Pravda Sept. 7:

The turn from confrontation in relations between countries with differing social systems towards peaceful coexistence and mutually beneficial cooperation is an extremely important achievement of peace-loving states and peoples.

This turn was not accomplished automatically. The substantial positive developments in the international situation, as was noted once again at the Conference of Communist and Workers Parties of Europe, are the result of the changed con-

stellation of forces in favor of the cause of peace, democracy, national liberation, independence and socialism. These new factors "are of decisive significance for affirming the policy of peaceful coexistence and the development of active cooperation among all countries as the only alternative to world nuclear war."

To assure that the mechanism of detente, constructed with such great labor, works more and more reliably and fruitfully — this the Soviet Union considers its duty.

"The development and deepening of detente, CPSU General Secretary L.I. Brezhnev has remarked, "is the command of the times and the demand of all peoples, dictated by their vital interest in a firm peace. And anyone who shows indulgence towards the campaign of the enemies of detente or gives in to their pressure due to various conjunctural considerations, is taking on a serious responsibility.

"More so than ever before, adherence to detente must at this time be measured in concrete deeds, in everyday work in the name of that lofty goal."

The history of international relations in the post-war period has provided no paucity of evidence as to how monstrously the foreign policy of capitalist countries can develop in those cases, when it is guided not by rational considerations, but by anti-Soviet, anti-communist prejudices. The well-known American politician W. Fulbright, in his day, stated reasonably that, during the Cold War period, "anti-communist obsessions" drove politicians, in particular some U.S. leaders, to "irresponsible actions." "When it came to communists," remarked Fulbright, "our leaders ceased to be guided by normal practice, which requires that conclusions be based on some sort of proof. Anti-communist ideology spared us from the need to take into account concrete facts and concrete situations." This sort of stiff policy did not have a chance for success in the modern world, and it had to be consigned to the archives.

The progress in detente is visible. Take Europe. Because of the conference in Helsinki, the states of our continent have learned better and more persistently to seek ways to solve pressing international problems. Practice confirms that when a realistic and responsible approach to the conduct of affairs between states prevails, there are ways to be found for solving even the most difficult of questions.

But general peace is not yet guaranteed. Each step is taken with intense struggle. Forced — against their will — to admit the existing realities of the world, certain circles in the imperialist camp do not intend to be reconciled to them once and for all. The peace-loving forces of humanity are today encountering a massive ideological attack on the policy of detente.

The adherents of the policy of confrontation can now no longer come out openly. Therefore they resort to political mimicry, speculating on the aspirations of peoples towards peace and security. They are trying to revive years-old anti-Soviet, anti-communist prejudices; they even go so far as to say that they stand in defense of peace, which is supposedly being threatened by . . . the Soviet Union.

Millions of people on earth know, however, that the Soviet Union is the only one of the great powers which is not increasing its military expenditures every year, is not seeking military bases, and is not striving for hegemony. The history of the Soviet Union's struggle for disarmament over more than half a century indicates that, if the matter had depended on the USSR alone, negotiations on all aspects of the problem of disarmament would long ago have been crowned with success.

Those circles with an interest in poisoning the international atmosphere are conducting a noisy campaign, the true goal of which is to present in a false light the position of the peace-loving forces, which are working to give detente an irreversible character.

Attempting to "motivate" the need for the West to reject the policy of detente, the English Daily Telegraph, for example, simply asserts that the West has supposedly "been betrayed." The New York Times, in turn, frightens its readers by claiming that detente creates conditions for applying the "dominoes tactic." This "tactic" consists, they say, in the communists' spoiling to "liquidate" the countries of the non-communist world one by one.

While these circles pay lip service to detente, they try to instill their own imperialist content into this concept. They would be happy to interpret it as that situation in which the forces of imperialism and reaction had a free hand to strangle the peoples struggling for national and social liberation, and those fighting against imperialism would be unable to fulfill their international duty in regard to the peoples defending the just cause of freedom.

But all calculations on a return to yesterday are in vain. No one is able to change the laws of class struggle and the national liberation movement of the peoples. Attempts to stop the forward course of history, leading to the liberation of humanity from imperialist rule, have been undertaken before. But it is well known that they invariably failed.

It is necessary to be a realist in one's approach to the policy of detente. It would be, for instance, naive to suppose that the ruling circles in the Western countries could take the side of the working class in its struggle with the oppression of the monopolies or take the side of oppressed peoples seeking freedom. But why then make accusations against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries when they, true to internationalist principles, extend aid to legal governments and peoples who are defending a just cause? Detente is by no means a safeguard for regimes condemned by history. No one can forbid peoples to struggle for a better life. But strict observance of the principles of non-interference in the affairs of other states and respect for their independence and sovereignty are indeed necessary conditions for relaxation of tensions.

Straining to turn public opinion in their countries against the policy of detente, its enemies also advance this "argument": detente is unacceptable because communists and other enemies of imperialism do not give up ideological struggle. And the people who say this are the very ones funding the activity of ideological war centers directed against the world of socialism, such as the CIA-run radio stations Liberty and Free Europe, which function on the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany! Do these gentlemen actually wish the countries of the socialist community to stop exposing the subversive, diversionary-espionage activities of those who day and night propagandize animosity and hatred among peoples?

In our time, the idea of detente is one of the most popular in the world. In order to weaken its attractive force, scholars too are mobilized. At New York University, for example, there was a special conference on "Detente in an Historical Perspective." A particularly characteristic presentation there was that of Professor Ubank, who attempted to explain the "danger" of detente with a dubious excursion into history.

This learned man assured the audience that on the eve of World War II, England, France and the U.S. supposedly were conducting, in their relations with Hitler's Germany... the policy of "detente," and as a result of this policy these powers were "entrapped." And therefore, the West today ought not to go too far on the path of detente with the USSR. Thus, in an attempt to play on people's desire for security, the American professor does not stop at crude distortion of historical truth. The

Soviet Union saved humanity from fascism. At the same time, it is known that the policy of the Western powers in regard to fascist Germany was directed, not at all to achieving peace in Europe. It was a policy of supporting the aggressor and indulging his malicious plans. And there is nothing surprising in the fact that this policy eventually turned against its creators.

By sowing suspicious against the peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community, the open and covert enemies of international cooperation hope to split the forces which are against war and reaction. It is no surprise that the Maoist schismatics are among the enemies of peace. The very logic of Peking's chauvinist nationalistic policy led them there.

Lawfully, the attempts to turn humanity back to the times of the Cold War are actively repulsed by the socialist countries and other peace-loving states and by the broader democratic public.

The communists are in the vanguard of this struggle. "In order to ensure the stability, further deepened, and expansion of detente," stated the participants of the Berlin conference, "it is necessary that the decisions taken in Helsinki be upheld and buttressed by the struggle of the popular masses for their complete implementation, for bridling and driving back those reactionary forces, which reject the results of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and try to foil the policy of detente and security of peoples."

Attempts to turn back the process of normalization of the international situation are not supported by the realistically thinking circles in the West either. This is indicated, particularly, by a number of recent statements by heads of state and government from France, Finland, the Federal Republic of Germany, and other countries in Western Europe. The course of the electoral campaign in the U.S. also fairly unambiguously shows that the policy of heating up tensions is rejected by broad layers of the American people. Many U.S. politicians justly note that relaxation in relations between the United States and the USSR is not some "favor" granted to the Soviet Union or vice versa, but is a policy reflecting the reality of our time.

The policy of detente has grown deep roots in the political life of today's world. There exists every ground for making the materialization of detente continuous and a more viable and comprehensive, universal process, for fulfilling political detente with military and taking concrete steps toward disarmament. This is a policy dictated by reason. It alone corresponds to the vital interests of all humanity.

**U.S. Labor Party
Presidential Platform
'76 Supplement**

The Emergency Employment Act of 1976

*by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.
U.S. Labor Party Presidential Candidate*

\$1.00

Order from:
Campaigner Publications P.O. Box 1972 New York, N.Y. 10001