

War Threat Increases

Atlanticists Go For "Show of Force" Against Soviets

Aug. 7 (NSIPS)—A series of statements and planted articles spawned from the highest Atlanticist quarters over the course of this past week combines to confirm the aggravated urgency with which Lower Manhattan is desperately striving to stage a "Show of Force" thermonuclear showdown with the Soviet Union in the immediate period ahead. The acceleration thus evidenced in the Atlanticists' pursuit of policies whose inevitable culmination — if unchecked — is early thermonuclear war through a Warsaw Pact annihilating preemptive nuclear first and second strikes against the U.S., Great Britain and the Federal Republic of Germany, is directly related to the present international strategic situation, now in the process of shifting decidedly to the disadvantage of the Lower Manhattan War Party. A summary outline of the primary features comprising the current strategic shift shows at a glance the "why" of the Atlanticist desire for earliest possible "Show of Force" staging:

1) The Atlanticists' terror over the growing potential for the August 16 Colombo Conference of the non-aligned nations to ratify sufficiently large debt moratoria provisions against Rockefeller and allied Lower Manhattan financiers, so as to effect, in short order, the total political demise of Atlanticism.

2) The current Soviet marginally decisive strategic nuclear war-winning capability over NATO — with the margin widening all the time.

3) The Atlanticists' inability to date to entrap either the Soviet leadership or President Ford into staging a "Show of Force"—nuclear brinkmanship act over any of the multitude of Atlanticist synthetically created "hot spots" dotting the Third World. To emphasize the point, the Third World is studded with Atlanticist-implanted "Sarajevo's". To date neither Ford nor the Soviet leadership has been manipulated into snapping confrontation-wise at the professed "Sarajevo" bait.

4) The Soviets' explicit support on the pages of Pravda for third world efforts at Colombo for a new world economic order and recognition of debt as the obstacles to economic development, combined with a previously unheard of number of urgent warnings on the dangers of nuclear war, which singularly and most crucially did not make the error of lumping President Ford into the War Party. In contrast to Lower Manhattan and the Carter camp, Ford is recognized by the Soviets to stand where he indeed is, in the anti-war camp.

It is precisely this present strategic shift that has been registered by the Atlanticist camp, and has produced the "go for broke with a Show of Force now" decision so clearly evident in recent "leaked" Atlanticist policy statements.

The major well-publicized "leaks" which signalled the Atlanticist desperate and extremely dangerous drive for an attempted pre-Colombo showdown were signalled by Lord Chalfont in the London Times, C.L. Sulzberger in the New York Times, Melvin Laird in the Readers Digest lead article for August, and the combined developments around Kissinger's Boston confrontation speech and the depraved Secretary of State's subsequent departure on a Middle East brinkmanship-fomenting tour.

The key feature of both the Lord Chalfont and the Sulzberger pieces was their open recognition of the Soviet Union's strategic superiority and was-winning capability, growing continuously, and from this admission drawing the conclusion from the At-

lanticists' perverse standpoint of necessity of a nuclear showdown with the Soviet Union before the end of this year. Chalfont leaves this totally unambiguous: "... (The Soviets) now evidently believe that they could win such a war.... The truth is that the 'balance of terror', like that other well-loved cliché, 'detente', has become an alibi for the weak, a drug for the fearful, and a weapon for the ruthless..."

The publication of such policy statements by top Rockefeller henchmen is occurring in strict coherence with the Atlanticist push to the brink around Lebanon and Berlin.

Their publication parallels the current Atlanticist attempt to fashion their required showdown with the Soviet Union by renewed escalation in their long-standing Lebanon butchery, coupled with rising indications of planned moves against pro-Soviet Iraq (the current Kissinger stay in Iran constituting direct on-the-scene evidence of war-provoking designs). Simultaneously, the Wall Street war hawks have launched their West German bastion on an escalating series of border violations and war-mongering provocations directed against the Soviet Union and the German Democratic Republic which now entail the very possible threat of a U.S.-Soviet showdown over Berlin.

The news arriving from West Germany, West Berlin and Moscow leaves no doubt that there is quickly developing major buildup toward a grave Berlin crisis. Mr. Kissinger's and Mr. Rockefeller's pathetic political underlings both inside and out of the government of the Federal Republic of Germany have, for over a month, engaged in an endless string of provocations against the Warsaw Pact, including border violations, shootings across the border, torch-light parades along the border, grenade throwings, arrests of diplomats, gross violations of the status of the city of West Berlin and the most hideous propaganda invective that West Germany's pathetic press has conducted since the days of Dr. Goebbels.

Key objective of this campaign which Henry Kissinger is directing, is to entrap President Ford in a military showdown against the Warsaw Pact as soon as possible — preferably before the Colombo summit of the Non-Aligned Nations.

The Atlanticists have failed to date to rope Ford into a confrontation stance over any of their games in the Third World. They now hope that President Ford, faced with a crisis of Atlanticist manufacture in the heart of Europe, will respond differently, and sanction a collision course with the Warsaw Pact.

Whether or not an actual "Snow or Force" materializes over Berlin or the Mideast in the coming days or weeks can be predicted by no one at this juncture. However the Atlanticists' demonstrated 100 per cent commitment to gamble with war in the days and weeks ahead underscores that the line dividing war and peace has never been thinner.

Sulzberger: Soviets Will Have War-Winning Capability This Year

Following are excerpts from an article by C. L. Sulzberger in the Aug. 4 New York Times, titled "Are We—or Is Our Strategy—MAD?"

A gloomy stir has been created in NATO Europe by the
War Threat 17

University of Miami's publication of a book called *War Survival in Soviet Strategy*, by Prof. Leon Gouré. . . .

He believes Moscow has never accepted the American idea of a balance of terror and that Dr. Strangelove idea, MAD. . . .

"Foreign Report" (of the Economist — ed.) predicts the U.S.S.R. will have valid strategic superiority by the end of this year and asserts its leaders believe they could then destroy an adversary without suffering unacceptable reprisals. It says Moscow has invested enormously in civil defense and survival programs while the Americans have unilaterally mothballed their antimissile defense system. Russian military writers believe their country's casualties in a nuclear war would be about equal to or even less than those of World War II. . . .

In the past decade Moscow has spent more than \$65 billion on assorted civil defense measures, compared with \$17 billion in the United States. . . .

The Russians are deploying ten new land-based ballistic missile systems and are already ahead of America in nuclear throw-weight, total ICBM's and submarine-launched megatonnage. By 1980 it is possible they may surpass the United States in strategic bombers. . . .

"Foreign Report" relates all this to a background of Kremlin sweet talk featured by last year's Helsinki European security accord. . . .

I am in no position to judge the veracity of this information but it is certainly well within the realm of probability that approximately this kind of approach has been going on. . . .

Surely the American people have a right to be informed about the truth of the statements made above so that they can debate whether it is necessary to revise our strategic assumptions. Mere national survival should be the paramount issue of this autumn's election. Are we — or is our strategy — MAD?

Charles Yost:

Need for Fascism at Home For America's 'New World Role'

Aug. 5 (NSIPS) — The following is an extract from an article by columnist Charles M. Yost, appearing in the Baltimore Sun, Wednesday, Aug. 4.

"U.S. Recasting Its Global Role"

. . . In the last 15 years, there have arisen to independence about 100 nations who are consumed by a burning sense of injustice inherited from a century or more of colonial exploitation . . . and who . . . demand a new international economic order which will redistribute the world's wealth more evenly.

Facing these billions are the 30 or so developed countries . . . who have for some years been skimming off a modest share of their surplus to aid less-developed peoples, but who show no disposition to give up the comforts to which they are accustomed.

Nor are they yet persuaded that exploding population growth, increasing pressure on the biosphere, nuclear proliferation, civil strife and terrorism emanating from this teeming third world make it in their own interests to do so.

All the ingredients are present for confrontations. . . .

It is this impending confrontation, barely present in the consciousness of the affluent peoples — coupled with the likely revival of East-West confrontation if much more vigorous steps to dispel it are not taken — which constitutes the nightmare and the challenge to those who will be defining policy in Washington next year.

No matter how urgent this defining of policy . . . new policies will not stand up without a broad constituency in the Congress and the country to support them.

That constituency does not yet exist. . . .

The administration will need most of all the zeal and energies of all those associations, churches, unions and journals whose business is public rather than private weal and who, in their perceptions of the world, see a little more clearly than the rest of us the common interests that should bind all together. . . .

Melvin Laird:

Use NATO Against Cuba, USSR

Aug. 7 (NSIPS) — Following are excerpts from former Defense Secretary Melvin Laird's call for the use of NATO forces against Cuba in the lead article in the issue of Reader's Digest.

In brazen defiance of the Monroe Doctrine the Soviets have converted Cuba into a military base and springboard for anti-Western subversion and strategic thrusts all over the world. . . . Cuban experts joined the Palestinian training camps in Syria, tutoring terrorists from Japan, Germany and Iran as well as Arabs. The graduates depart to wreak global havoc. . . . We must convince the Kremlin that we recognize clearly that they are ultimately responsible for Cuban depredations. . . . A neo-isolationist attitude in Congress. . . . emboldened Kremlin leaders to throw down a challenge beyond daring a few years ago. We must arrive at a national resolve to counter the Kremlin's political warfare and Cuban aggressions. . . . We desperately need a Congress and a White House that are united in this resolve. . . .

This kind of Marxist intoxication in the Kremlin poses the greatest danger to world peace. We must stop passively swallowing Moscow's baited proxy challenges at the time, place and manner of their choosing and make our responses where, when and as we choose.

Lord Chalfont:

Soviets Ready Final Conflict; "Detente an Alibi for the Weak"

Aug. 5 (NSIPS) — Following are excerpts from a column in the London Times, Aug. 2, by the Rt. Hon. Lord Chalfont, PC, OBE. MC (Al Jones), which appeared under the title, "Why Russia may think she can win a nuclear war." Lord Chalfont is a director of IBM Europe.

Hands up all those who remember the Balance of Terror. . . . Sometimes the balance of terror was called the nuclear stalemate and sometimes just plain MAD (the acronym signified 'mutual assured destruction'. . . .) . . . The concept behind these gnomic phrases was that both the States and the Soviet Union had the power, even after a surprise nuclear attack by one upon the other, to retaliate in a manner which would inflict unacceptable damage on the attacker. . . .

I feel bound to draw attention to the fact that the nuclear balance. . . is being demolished before our very eyes. . . . The sombre fact is that, while the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks have been going on, and partly as a result of American concessions during those negotiations, the Soviet Union has achieved a position of strategic nuclear superiority over the United States.

. . . the nuclear balance ceases to exist at the moment when one side believes that it has acquired the capacity to deliver an effective nuclear attack upon the other **and survive the ensuing retaliation**. My proposition is that the Soviet Union is resolved to acquire that capacity in the very near future.

. . . The Russians. . . will have to satisfy two principal conditions.

Their 'first strike' must be able to destroy a substantial proportion of the American striking force,...and casualties among the civilian population must be kept to an 'acceptable' level....

...Since 1967 the Russians have gradually surpassed the Americans in nuclear strength...they will, by 1980, even have superiority in strategic bombers. The inescapable conclusion is that they have therefore acquired the ability to destroy, in a first strike, a larger proportion of the American striking force.

...They (the Soviets-ed.) are also (in violation of the Strategic Arms Limitation agreements) improving their massive radar systems to give them increased early warning. But none of this...would imply a really decisive change in the nuclear balance if the American retaliatory strike force were still capable of killing 30 million Russians; and it is here that the Soviet Civil Defence programme must take its place in the calculations.

Mr. Leon Gouré, Russian who emigrated to the United States in 1940 and became an advisor on civil defence to the American government, has recently published an authoritative study indicating that the Soviet Union is now spending more than \$1,000 million a year on civil defense...Soviet planners now claim that casualties from a United States nuclear strike would be between seven and twelve millions — far below the American calculation of what is unacceptable....

The significance of this policy is that it pursues to its logical conclusion a belief that has been consistently at the heart of Soviet military thinking — namely that any war with the West will be a nuclear war. They now evidently believe that American threats of 'assured destruction' are without substance or credibility and that the Soviet Union could win such a war.

Nuclear blackmail now becomes a very real threat; yet the West continues to believe, with the unshakable conviction of a mental patient who thinks he is Napoleon, that 'no one can win a nuclear war' and that therefore it will never happen. While the Russians coldly prepare their people — psychologically, mentally and materially for the 'final conflict,' western politicians are content to brainwash theirs into believing that no threat exists outside the fevered minds of the doomwatchers, and that SALT and the Helsinki Declaration are adequate substitutes for an effective strategy. The truth is that the 'balance of terror,' like that other well-loved cliché, 'detente' has become an alibi for the weak, a drug for the fearful, and a weapon for the ruthless. A foreign and defence policy directed upon it is a dangerous exercise in self-deception.

Soviet Leader Assesses Strategic Situation: The Enemies of Detente Are On the Counteroffensive

Aug. 6 (NSIPS) — The following is excerpted from an article by Boris Ponomarev, candidate member of the Politburo of the Soviet Communist Party; it originally appeared in the Soviet theoretical journal, Kommunist, and has since been reprinted in a number of Eastern European newspapers.

Reviewing the recent Berlin Conference of European Communist and Workers Parties, Ponomarev analyzes three capitalist factions in the West: a war faction, soft centrists drifting into the war faction, and a third tendency that is sane, with whom the socialist states can deal, but who also might be drawn into war. The article is thus a direct warning that the Soviets are ready to go to war if all forces in the West capitulate to the Rockefeller faction.

... According to Western sources, detailed plans have been worked out (at recent NATO meetings) for the NATO countries to wage a nuclear war against the Soviet Union and other members of the Warsaw Treaty Organization. . . .

It is entirely obvious that these activities of the Atlantic politicians contradict the agreements of the all-European conference in Helsinki. It is further clear that the path onto which the militarist forces are trying to push the world leads away from the goals which were promulgated there.

Life constantly confirms that NATO is the most important tool for blocking the process of political detente and the chief instrument engaged against military detente. At the same time, NATO serves as the bulwark of the most reactionary, militarist and conservative forces in their efforts to hinder democratic changes in the capitalist countries. . . .

Today, because detente has grown deep roots and is ever more creating the preconditions for becoming irreversible, the enemies of peace are attempting to go on the counteroffensive. With incredible cynicism, the advocates of cold war speak openly of their intentions to have done with detente and force the arms race ahead, in order to reestablish the policy of balancing on the brink of war.

The voices of the moderate current of the ruling class are appearing more often in the chorus of those who have never made a secret of their enmity to the improvement of international relations. The representatives of this current had attached to detente their own hopes to split the socialist and weaken the positions of the liberation movement. Now that these hopes are wrecked, they are demonstrating their "disappointment" in detente. But as for the realistically thinking circles who advocate further development of detente, they succumb to conjunctural considerations and at times give in to pressure, taking steps which lead away from the policy of peaceful coexistence and mutually advantageous cooperation. It is impossible not to see that the activities of the enemies of detente, if they are not met with the necessary opposition, are capable of creating a psychological climate which will not only be a real obstacle to the advancement of the detente process, but facilitate a regression. . . .

Taken together, the forces of peace are now strong and many, and possess significantly greater potential than before. They are collectively in a position to solve the historical tasks which face Europe today. . . .

In this connection, the conference devoted special attention to analyzing the crisis process in the capitalist countries. It was shown that what is now going on in these countries is the result of a rapid deepening of the general crisis of the capitalist system. It encompasses all aspects of life of society: economic, social, political and moral. Inflation is rampant and unemployment has not abated. All this indicates how untenable are those prognoses which interpreted a certain part of the cyclical decline of production as the end of the crisis. The general crisis of the bourgeois order is growing. The political expression of this is the flaring of the class struggle. . . .

In the aftermath of the great depression of 1929-1933 . . . extraordinarily intense class struggle occurred in Germany, the USA, and in many small and medium sized countries. One part of the bourgeoisie wanted to deal with this process through reforms and partial measures (Roosevelt's New Deal, for example). Another part, on the other hand, took the path of fascism and military adventurism. The situation was such that the latter method prevailed. Fascism and war — this is the answer that imperialism gave to the crisis at one time. Now we have a different situation. Reaction can no longer count on getting out of the crisis directly through war. The forces which could deal such a strategy a defeat are too strong, with results threatening the existence of capitalism itself. . . . The urgency of international

solidarity is defined by the fact that the forces of world imperialism, despite the differences among themselves, coordinate their strategy, especially on questions of struggle against the forces of communism and the liberation movement. International solidarity in our time is crucial for the struggle against imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism, as well as for overcoming backwardness, establishing a new international economic order and the right of every people to determine its own destiny.

Pravda Asks: Who Is Whipping Up The Arms Race?"

Aug. 6 (NSIPS) — Following are excerpts from an article on the Strategic Arms Limitation talks (SALT II) which appeared in the official Soviet Communist Party daily, Pravda, Aug. 4. The article, by Konstantin Georgiyev, appeared under the title, "Who is Whipping Up the Arms Race?"

In his speech at the Conference of Communist and Workers Parties of Europe in Berlin, June 29 of this year, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union L. I. Brezhnev remarked that the success achieved in recent years in relaxation of international tensions has inspired and strengthened the forces of peace and progress. . . . But at the same time the forces of reaction and militarism have been activated — those who want to turn Europe and the whole world back to the time of "cold war" and balancing on the brink of nuclear catastrophe.

This includes particularly those who are making profits by the production of weapons of death and destruction, those who think of no other political career for themselves than igniting a "Crusade" against the countries of socialism, against the communists, or those who openly call for "preparation for a new war," like the Maoist leadership of China, calculating to benefit from confrontations between other states and peoples. . . .

In an attempt to justify this dangerous and wasteful course in the West, they again and again drag out the threadbare myth of the notorious "Soviet threat." . . . They assert that military expenditures in the USSR and other socialist countries are steadily growing — more, they allege, than in the western countries; that the number of armed forces of the USSR is supposedly also growing at a threatening rate; that in the Soviet Union strategic armaments are growing on a scale which threatens to severely disturb the correlation of forces between the USSR and U.S. in this field.

Let us take up these three theses — or more precisely, their complete invalidity — in more detail.

But first it must be said: we have no intention of minimizing the might of the Soviet armed forces. As long as aggressive military blocs exist, as long as there are forces like those mentioned above, the Soviet people and the peoples of the other socialist countries cannot of course be unconcerned about their defense. . . .

On Military expenditures

The proliferating fabrications in the West about the imaginary growth of military expenditures in the USSR reached a kind of climax in the publication in the USA at the beginning of this year of two "reports" of the Central Intelligence Agency.

In one of them there was a sensational "revelation": it was revealed that for many years the specialists of the USA have "mistakenly underestimated," by almost double, the level of military expenditures in the USSR. But do the sorry American spies produce any kind of proof that their present calculations are correct? Absolutely none whatsoever. . . .

But here is the thing — even doubling their previous (also overestimated) calculations of Soviet military expenditures, the manipulators from the CIA discovered that figures for the military spending of the USSR in 1975 were still two times less than American military spending for the same year. . . .

Then, without batting an eye, the slanderers decided to resort to the following trick: they cooked up another CIA report, with calculations of what — in dollars and at American prices — the maintenance and equipping of the Soviet armed forces would cost the United States (?!) . . .

The idea is completely absurd, considering the different economic systems of the two countries, the different principles of pricing, the inflation in the USA, etc. But the result of such a strange method of calculation, as its inventors showed, was precisely to order. Former director of the CIA W. Colby openly admitted that they "did this because it had been demanded of them." True enough, the authors of the report noted themselves that results achieved by such a method cannot be considered "a measure of actual Soviet defense expenditures. . . ." However this admission is buried in the middle of the report — on the calculation that few people would read the whole report, and the false story that Soviet military expenditures in dollars are more than the military expenditures of the USA . . . was trotted out in huge letters on the pages of the newspapers. . . .

No special insight is needed to understand why, under these circumstances, such fabrications about the imaginary growth of military expenditures of the USSR are appearing, and whom they serve. As for the goal of the published CIA findings, the bulletin of the Washington Center of Defense Information, "Defense Monitor," correctly wrote: "Congress and the American people are now undergoing the most intensive campaign of intimidation since 1960." And further, "Calculations in dollars of Soviet military expenditures has nothing in common with how much the Soviet Union actually spends for defense, and provides no basis to judge the sufficiency or insufficiency of the armed forces of the USA." . . .

However the so-called big press of the USA — the huge-circulation papers and journals which love to plume themselves on their "impartiality," either keep quiet altogether on such critical statements, or print them very stingily and in obscure places, while slanderous fabrications of the Pentagon and the CIA they, of course, put on the front pages.

The essence of the fabrications spread in the USA in this regard is that the number of Soviet armed forces in recent years has supposedly increased so much that it is double the number of American armed forces.

Here too, everything is distorted. . . the Pentagon, in calculating the number of Soviet armed forces, includes for example border and domestic troops, which have no relation to the question at hand. Furthermore, including in its over-all calculations of Soviet armed forces the personnel involved in construction and work and other auxiliary functions, the Pentagon at the same time is silent about the fact that in the USA analogous work is done by private firms, and the number of workers here, of course, is not included in the calculations of the size of the American army. . . .

On this question the American leaders themselves have more than once noted the existence of factors underlying the necessity of the USSR to have more armed forces than the USA. Thus, President of the USA G. Ford, in one of his recent speeches, reasonably observed: "The Soviet Union has a thousand-mile or even longer border with the Peoples Republic of China. . . . We, the United States, have friendly relations on the one side with the Canadians, and on the other with the Mexicans. We do not have to maintain half of our armed forces either on the northern or the southern border. In addition to this, in the west the Soviet Union faces the armed forces of NATO. Thus, it has two borders

which it must staff with a full complement of personnel, with no reductions. Thus, to use simple numbers without understanding the essence of the problem, means not to take into account the facts of life."

Clearly stated. All the stranger that governmental organs of the USA subordinate to the President do not pay attention to the facts, and moreover distort them in every way.

On Strategic Armaments

Here the main efforts of the enemies of detente and of curtailing the arms race are directed at showing that, under cover of the agreement on strategic arms limitations the Soviet Union has rapidly increased its strategic armaments, and that this supposedly threatens the United States with every imaginable woe. . . .

Everything that is done in the USSR in this area lies fully and completely within the bounds of the 1972 accord. The President, the Secretary of State and the Defense Minister of the USA have also more than once — including recently — categorically denied any notions concerning violation by the Soviet side of these agreements. . . .

And now let us turn to the facts concerning the prolonged discussion of a new long-term Soviet-American agreement on these questions. The delay — as L.I. Brezhnev observed in his June 29 speech, "now of several months' duration — it must be stated directly — is not our fault." . . .

At a press conference July 10 of this year, Secretary of State of the USA H. Kissinger admitted that the main questions under discussion are the USA's construction of the so-called cruise missiles and the question of the Soviet bomber, called the "Backfire" in the West. . . .

The former Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Air Force, T. Hoops, speaking of the American position on the negotiations on the cruise missiles and the "Backfire," stated: "The American proposal hypocritically ignores the fact that the two types of weapons under discussion have completely different potential capabilities." And further: "The 'Backfire' bomber was completely artificially brought in. . . . It is hardly surprising that the Russians have rejected such a dishonest proposal." . . .

Bulgarian Leader:

NATO's Tanks Are Irrelevant— The Next War Will Be Nuclear

Aug. 7 (NSIPS) — The following is excerpted from an interview with Bulgarian Communist Party leader and Chief of State Todor Zhikov which appeared in the Aug. 4 French daily Le Monde. Responding to questions from Le Monde's Foreign Editor, André Fontaine, Zhikov characterized the recent conference in East Berlin of European Communist Parties as "constituting an important contribution to the struggle for peace, security, cooperation and social progress on our continent." The Bulgarian Chief of State then suddenly interjected:

But let me tell you something else: Lenin had foreseen the day when the creation of a terrible weapon would make of any war a catastrophe. I (recently) told the head of government of a neighboring country: you have tanks, we have them also. If ever a war broke out, they would not even have time to reach the borders. Nuclear arms would immediately enter into action. The number one task of our epoch is peace. It is this question which was at the center of the Berlin conference. Once peace has been ensured in the entire world, we can discuss the point of knowing whether or not one should utilize the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat and under what form it should be implemented...

There is no other solution but peaceful coexistence to avoid nuclear war... There are, however, circles who are interested in the maintenance of military tension, of the pursuit of the arms race. They do everything to undermine peace and security between the peoples. We are witnessing a campaign in certain Western countries for the increase of military budgets, (we are witnessing) the inspiration of a new military crisis in the Middle East... These are fortunately not the circles who determine the spirit of the present international situation... Realistic politicians of the West also contribute to cleansing the international climate. But there still exists a potential danger that it (the reactionary campaign) will not be slowed down, that the results obtained up until the present time will be liquidated...

The Lebanese crisis is the result of the subversive policy led by the imperialist and reactionary forces in the Middle East. Their aim is to deal a blow against the progressive forces and, in particular, the Palestinian resistance. Attempts to resolve the crisis through foreign interferences have not yielded any positive results. On the contrary, they have complicated even more the already tragic situation of that country. The position of the Popular Republic of Bulgaria towards the events in Lebanon is a clear and principled one: establishment of a just and durable peace, respecting the independence, sovereignty, national integrity of the country and the right of the Lebanese people to decide alone, without any foreign interference, its destiny..."

US Labor Party
Presidential Campaign Statement

THE DANGER OF GENERAL WAR

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

\$1.25

Mail Check or Money Order to:
NSIPS Circulation Manager
GPO Box 1972
New York, NY 10001
