

U.S. LABOR PARTY CAMPAIGN REPORT



LaRouche:

“If Carter Gets In, This Nation Is Going To War”

Oct. 21 (NSIPS) — The warning against nuclear war by U.S. Labor Party presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. reached 4.9 million Americans on NBC's Meet the Press show Sunday Oct. 17. LaRouche appeared along with the candidates of the American Party, the Socialist Workers Party, and the Libertarian Party. Below are excerpts from the Meet the Press transcripts.

LaRouche: There are four considerations that you have to take into account to determine what is going to happen with the election, and no one at this point can determine who is going to win. Behind Carter, running around grinning like a frightened Rhesus monkey, there is a group of men, headed by people such as Schlesinger, associated with Paul Nitze, the Brookings Institution, and others, who at this point are committed to thermonuclear war in the early future. If Carter gets into the White House, elected on Nov. 2 this nation will be destroyed in thermonuclear war before the summer — and that could come even earlier.

Ford, on the other hand, has been, up and through the Republican convention, opposed to this kind of policy, but since the convention he has turned his back on his own mainstream Republicans and has become virtually a pawn of Kissinger, Laird, and that sort of people, and he has backed down horribly. We have seen a personality change in Ford which should frighten us all very much....

Meanwhile, as a result of efforts of myself and others, we have an option for dealing with an international monetary crisis which is on right now. We are right now internationally in the process of monetary collapse.

If forces get up on their hind legs in this country and elsewhere and move with a policy which I am principally responsible for introducing, and if they force the White House to move in that direction quickly, we will avoid an otherwise inevitable depression; we will avoid war.

Means (Marianne Means, Hearst newspapers — ed.): Mr. LaRouche, in your opening statement you said that Jimmy Carter was committed to thermonuclear war. That is a very serious statement. Do you have any evidence of this?

LaRouche: Absolutely, and I think that perhaps you do. As you know, throughout the corridors of power, political, industrial and so forth, there has been, increasingly since the summer of 1973, a discussion of various kinds of military policy. These discussions are associated with the monetary crisis which is now in its crucial terminal phase. We had MC 14-4 which was the new flexible response pattern imposed upon Europe, to the fear of Europe. Now we have this Los Alamos-entitled version of defense policy, which is blitzkrieg war against the Soviet Union.

Means: But Jimmy Carter is not in a position to be making defense policy. You are tabbing this to Jimmy Carter.

LaRouche: Jimmy Carter is nothing but a pawn. It is a disgrace to the nation that a major party would put a man of such disqualification up before the public as a candidate....But behind him, the people who advise him, the people who try to get the concepts into the back of his head and out the front of his

mouth, people like Cyrus Vance, Zbigniew Brzezinski, George Ball, Schlesinger, particularly Schlesinger who briefed him for the debate in San Francisco. Schlesinger and Rostow, to my direct knowledge, are committed to thermonuclear war now. Rostow has advertised the thesis that we are already at World War III, we ought to get about fighting it.

The whole establishment, the New York Council on Foreign Relations, the Brookings Institution, despite the fact that it has criticism for Schlesinger, the Rand Corporation, the Hoover Institute, the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, and that group that has tried to brief the Business Council this past week in Virginia. The word is out. We have got it all over the world. We have got it from every source, including the highest sources in the U.S., the highest sources in foreign government, that if Carter gets in, this nation is going to war.

And the problem is that Ford, who is formally opposed to this stupid policy, is being weak-kneed at this point. That is the danger before this nation right now.

Means: But you say you have got the word. I mean, you don't have any evidence, you don't have any —

LaRouche: I say you and I do — you probably do, because you probably have access to the same kind of sources that I do.

Means: Well, I don't happen to believe that Carter is committed to thermonuclear war.

LaRouche: I assure you. I have talked — unfortunately the information was given to me in confidence — but I have seen signed documents by Rostow and others indicating a deliberate commitment to thermonuclear war. Now, that is the situation.

Hentoff (Nat Hentoff of the Village Voice — ed.): Mr. LaRouche, the U.S. Labor Party and its arm, the National Caucus of Labor Committees, from time to time has used selective violence as a political strategem. I mean beating up members of the Communist Party, the Socialist Workers Party, and diverse other leftists. Do you have a political rationale for this, or is it just exercise for the troops between electoral campaigns?

LaRouche: Well, first of all, Mr. Hentoff, you have been engaged in that sort of lying before this —

Hentoff: Well, that leaves me, and the Washington Post, the New York Times, and the wire services. We all have the proof.

LaRouche: Wait a minute. In federal court, at this time, coming up for a decision before Judge Duffy...FBI Director Kelley, (Attorney General) Levi, members of the ABC staff, and so forth are involved in a violation or potential contempt of federal court by the Department of Justice in connection with coordinating the circulation of precisely such slander.

Now...we know that the forces behind this, who have been behind it for years, are those associated with Raskin (head of the Institute for Policy Studies — ed.) and other conduits, principally people who are now associated with backers of the Carter campaign. And what is going on is, Rosenfeld says in the Washington Post, and as you are doing here...“In respect to the U.S. Labor Party, try to prevent them, block them from receiving any objective coverage, and raise these kinds of slanders....”

...What you are saying, in effect, your question, is a lie. There are incidents, there are facts. We were attacked by the Communist Party repeatedly. We were attacked by others. This operation was coordinated by associates of Marcus Raskin who is now a member of the Carter campaign support organization.

Hentoff: Let me ask you one more question, then: In your literature over the past couple of years there has been an extraordinary, to me, ecumenical grand plot involving the Russian KGB, the British Intelligence, the CIA, and others of our intelligence agencies, and that conspiracy of intelligence agencies has been directed, among other things, toward destroying you and your party; and I have yet to see any evidence of this.

LaRouche: Well, that is a question of your mental abilities and honesty, Mr. Hentoff....

Except for one period when we were led astray and mistakenly assumed the KGB was involved in something against us (which we later found out was not the case), it was a very good simulation by CIA-type agencies. There is a Cointelpro type operation of the type that Mr. Camejo (candidate of the Socialist Workers Party — ed.) complains —

Hentoff: I agree there is, directed against your party; there is no question about it.

LaRouche: Now, the Cointelpro operation against us happens to be on a much higher and more intense and concerned level than the type of which Mr. Camejo and his party justly complain. You are a part of that operation, because you know what it is.

Kilpatrick (*James Kilpatrick, Washington Star Syndicate — ed.*): In one of your early speeches, it was back in 1975, you had some rather unkind things to say about people who were involved in sales. You spoke of the cushy job of a salesperson. You described such salespersons as prostitutes and said they have no integrity. I would imagine a good many laboring people are involved in sales of some sort. What did you mean by that?

LaRouche: I think, Mr. Kilpatrick, you are guilty of a slight fallacy of composition there....

The point was made there which is not so much against the persons or the person who indulges in certain kinds of sales practices, but against the morality of the position in which they are put.

Everybody in the United States knows what we mean by the used car salesman...some people think that Kissinger went into politics to avoid being put into prison for becoming a used car salesman. But people are put in this kind of thing where they are compelled to propitiate....During the post-war period we have reduced drastically, particularly since 1967, the proportion of members of the labor force who engaged in skilled, semi-skilled productive occupations in industry, mining, agriculture, and so forth, transportation, and construction. The result of that is that we are in a deteriorating economy; we are not producing enough capital goods to maintain our productive capacity.

We are in a structural inflation as well as a wild monetary inflation and we have put people into categories of employment which may in some cases be necessary forms of employment, but they represent overhead. What we have done is increase the overhead function of society, the non-productive overhead function, and de-emphasize in our ethics and in our practice the essential role of producing wealth.

Kilpatrick: You mention morality and it runs all through your material, morality in your policy, and yet your key sir, seems to be the repudiation of debt, repudiation of debt in agriculture, municipalities, state bonds, public authorities, real estate debt. What is moral, sir, about the repudiation of debt that is honestly owed?

LaRouche: I will tell you about morality, this business about debt being immoral....

For every \$15,000 that is cut at present in the New York City budget, one person will die who would not otherwise die. The

people who propose to collect debt service on a global scale for a bankrupt monetary system which is built largely on hot air and confetti money to begin with — as George Ball, a Carter advisor, proposes in his book — they propose literal genocide against the majority of populations of Africa and Asia on behalf of this.

George Ball explicitly, along with Paddock (William Paddock, fascist agronomist — ed.) and other Carter advisors, proposes genocide to the tune of eliminating 30 million Mexicans out of 58 million in the interest of this debt collection policy. What is your morality? How do you weigh genocide in order to collect debt as against repudiating debt which is largely based on hot air and confetti money to begin with?

Kilpatrick: I am thinking of pension funds, for example, sir. Pension funds hold billions of dollars in the debt of municipalities and states.

LaRouche: Don't worry about it. I refer you to the Emergency Employment Act — which is a principal piece of domestic draft legislation which every informed circle in the United States is well aware of — for our approach to deal with this. Obviously if a person — insurance companies like the "Imprudential Life Insurance Company" or some other company of some strange name...were to go bankrupt, we have people on pensions who depend upon these insurance companies for pensions, for sickness assistance, that sort of thing. Obviously what do we have to do? The United States is bankrupt. The New York banks are bankrupt. The Eurodollar market is bankrupt. The International Monetary Fund is now collapsing. What are we going to do, let these people starve? With or without debt moratorium, the collapse is going to occur. Obviously the Social Security system, agency, under the general funds of the government will have to discount the claims that people have for pensions against bankrupt insurance companies to insure that those people obtain the means to live during that period. At present we have no means except the welfare system, which is a degrading and undignified system for meeting that kind of need.

Pettit (*Tom Pettit of NBC News — ed.*): Do you feel you are the contemporary Karl Marx?

LaRouche: Not exactly. Such things are better left to judgements of the future. These are questions which probably have no practical significance in the contemporary period.

Pettit: But doesn't that give some indication of the kind of thinking you have?

LaRouche: It might, in context. For example, my relationship to the Republican Party or the mainstream of the Republican Party in this country at this time is somewhat analogous to the relationship between Marx and the Republican Party of the 1860s. Here we are in the most profound crisis the United States has ever faced. We do not have a political labor movement which is organized in Western Europe or in the United States to cope and provide on its own the kind of alternative required. There are mainstream Republicans and anti-Carter Democrats who adhere to the traditional American standards that we fought the Revolutionary War for — in technological progress, industrial progress, agricultural progress. To the extent that Republicans and others will fight for that, then I, even though I am a socialist by conviction, must intervene. I can't sit by and say 'I am a socialist, since we can't have socialism, I will do nothing.' I must intervene at this time to assure the nation is safe.

Pettit: And that is why you would like Ford elected rather than Carter?

LaRouche: I don't like Ford elected, but the point is, it is a practical question. Ford is now the president. The crisis that confronts this nation will confront the nation before Jan. 22. Therefore, the problem is, can this weak but otherwise well-meaning president, can he turn back to the mainstream Republicans in whom I do have confidence as good people —

Monroe (*Bill Monroe, NBC Moderator — ed.*): I am sorry to interrupt, Mr. LaRouche, but our time is up.