

Editorial

Lebanon policy: Mondale vs. LaRouche

Walter Mondale, in a Jan. 3 speech to the National Press Club in Washington, delivered a typically "Kissingerian" attack on the conduct of foreign policy by President Ronald Reagan, whom he hopes to challenge next fall as the Democratic Party's presidential nominee. The drift of "Fritz's" remarks was that Reagan has been amateurish, and that Mr. Mondale's first concern, were he President, would be to set up annual summits with the Soviets and unilaterally disarm the United States by proclaiming the so-called nuclear "freeze."

Mr. Mondale then worked himself into a froth about the constant changes in U.S. policy in the Middle East under Reagan, stating that "we've had as many Middle East policies as we've had staff turnovers." Finally, "A President cannot ask Americans to risk their lives for a policy no one's in charge of, and no one understands. And for that and other reasons, I've called for a withdrawal of our Marines from Beirut," he said.

Interesting: Mr. Mondale's demand (and there's not a nickel's worth of difference between his stand on this issue and the other seven Democratic contenders enjoying major media attention) coincides with the "political solution" to the Lebanese crisis which Kissinger and his friends are telling the President he should adopt, so as not to lose the 1984 "peace vote" to Mr. Mondale. Kissinger and Mondale not only both came out of the Trilateral Commission that spawned the Carter-Mondale administration, but Kissinger is currently repeating the treachery by which he helped bring Carter to office while nominally part of the Ford administration in 1976.

The "political solution" is a misleading name for seeking to obtain the conditions for withdrawal of the U.S. military presence in Lebanon through the triple partition of that nation. The contradiction between this and Reagan's commitment to Lebanese sovereignty is the source of the policy-shifts of which Mr. Mondale so hypocritically complains.

EIR endorses the principles of a U.S. Lebanon policy enunciated Dec. 30 by Lyndon LaRouche, the only

major Democratic presidential candidate who dissents from the Kissinger "political solution":

"... I have been and remain committed absolutely to the restoration of the pre-April-1975 state of Lebanon, its constitution, and its sovereign borders. It is the sovereign right of the people of Lebanon—but not foreigners—to modify its constitution. The sovereign borders of Lebanon, at the point of outbreak of civil war in April 1975, according to international law and treaty-agreements existing as of that time, must not be diluted an iota. This matter is non-negotiable.

"The moral principles and other considerations requiring this policy of the United States are chiefly as follows:

(1) *The principle of sovereignty of states is the rock of the domestic and foreign policies of the United States. We must never be a party to its infringement; no existing precedent in our own or other nation's previous practice justifies any fresh violation of that principle.*

(2) *Under President Eisenhower, and more recently, the United States has committed itself to the efficient defense of the sovereignty of Lebanon. To abandon that commitment, insofar as we have means to honor it, puts a question mark on the honor and credibility of U.S. foreign-policy toward all nations.*

In practice:

(3) *The general condition of the Middle East and the role of Middle-East petroleum output is such, that the chain-reaction effects of a dissolution of Lebanon, by means of a so-called 'political solution,' or otherwise, would be a global disaster for the Middle East, and for the United States and its allies otherwise. If Lebanon is carved up, as the projected 'political solution' must accomplish this, the resulting added chaos within the Middle East must almost assuredly lead to destruction of every nation of the region, from Sudan and Egypt, into Turkey, into Pakistan and India. The reduction in petroleum-supplies to Western Europe, Japan, and developing nations widely, would be a global economic and strategic catastrophe."*