

Labor moves toward LaRouche for '80

Proponents of a Haig-Kennedy 'race' facing a dilemma

As the presidential campaign of U.S. Labor Party Chairman Lyndon LaRouche picks up support from leading unionists and other layers, the strategists at the Council on Foreign Relations who have planned a rigged 1980 Haig-Kennedy presidential race are confronted with an interesting dilemma: Should they continue accelerating their campaign to oust President Carter and risk fracturing the two-party system—allowing LaRouche's campaign to pick up large pieces of the traditionalist GOP and Democratic machinery?

The disintegration of the Carter Administration has become daily more public with both Treasury Secretary

Blumenthal and State Department chief Vance saying they would not serve a second term with Carter. Meanwhile, however, editorial writers at the *New York Times* and *Washington Post* have cautioned that making too much, too fast over the indictment of Carter's close personal friend, former Director of the Office of Management and Budget Bert Lance, or the obvious Democratic split provoked by Sen. Kennedy's challenge to Carter could be dangerous.

From the point of view of those who would like a controlled presidential race in which Alexander Haig and Sen. Ted Kennedy are fielded to a guillible

Teamsters official endorses anti-drug fight, LaRouche candidacy

Following is the text of Teamster Union official Rolland McMaster's endorsement of the presidential campaign of Lyndon LaRouche.

When Dr. William Banks, President of the International Masons and a previous endorser of Mr. LaRouche's Presidential candidacy, introduced LaRouche at this evening's Michigan Anti-Drug Coalition benefit, the crowd gave Mr. LaRouche a standing ovation. They certainly endorsed his views on the drug issue.

I recommend that all Teamster officials across the country seek out the Anti-Drug Coalition in their area to begin the work of ending this cancerous problem of our nation's youth. Teamster officials should do as I have done and listen to Mr. LaRouche's explanation of how to end the drug epidemic.

I was moved by this evening's event—I feel the fight against drugs is the major social issue in the U.S. today.

If only for the reason that he is committed to

saving our next generation from drugs, I will now endorse Lyndon LaRouche for President of the U.S. in 1980. From the response of the many other labor leaders in the audience, I am sure many of them join me in these sentiments.

Earlier this afternoon, I met with Mr. LaRouche privately. We discussed solutions to the drug problem, and to the other problems caused by our government allowing the basic American economic and social system to collapse. I enjoyed especially his position on the deregulation of the trucking industry, which is destroying the lifeblood of the Teamster organization. Mr. LaRouche has answers to the issues of drugs, inflation, the energy problem, and economic growth which would be very interesting to other leaders in the Teamsters and other labor organizations.

I therefore urge other Teamster officials and leaders of other unions across the country to meet and familiarize themselves with Mr. LaRouche and consider endorsing his candidacy for the reasons I have.

electorate by the Republicans and Democrats, the LaRouche campaign is a wild card. Already the LaRouche campaign has begun accumulating a significant list of endorsements from leading political figures in France, West Germany, Italy and Canada. LaRouche has also just completed a round of important meetings with influential Midwestern business leaders.

In the U.S., the LaRouche candidacy has been particularly boosted by the endorsement of LaRouche by Rolland McMaster, general organizer of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. McMaster's endorsement comes two weeks after leaders within the IBT announced the formation of a Teamster Committee to Elect LaRouche. The Committee began issuing public information bulletins on their activity with their circulation planned to reach 200,000 among industrial workers.

As one political analyst pointed out, "persons familiar with the history of the labor movement and particularly the IBT will understand the significance of McMaster's endorsement of LaRouche's candidacy and the international fight against drugs that he is associated with." McMaster has played a central role in building the IBT since the 1930s and is a leading expert on the economic effects deregulation would have on the trucking industry.

LaRouche's supporters are also engaged in the mass distribution of copies of McMaster's endorsement of LaRouche and are planning to get out 20,000 on the East Coast and in the Central States.

McMaster's statement of support for the LaRouche campaign may well be a catalyst in moving other trade union leaders to take similar action and endorse LaRouche.

How to unravel the mess called the U.S. economy

Presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche explained to the Detroit Chamber of Commerce Government Roundtable on May 18 why the current anti-inflation policies of the Carter Administration are failing. Here, with minor deletions, is his speech.

This is the season when the Republican Party will be blaming the Carter Administration for all the problems. That is not only unfair, but it is counterproductive. Granted, the Carter Administration has been a national disaster. The collapse of the dollar from DM 2.35 to the level of DM 1.80 where it is now propped up, is indicative of the nature of the major problem of

inflation. But the Carter Administration is bad from the economic standpoint mainly in the sense that, at a point where there is tremendous potential if we correct the accumulated problems of the postwar period, instead of correcting the problem, a larger dose of the disease is added.

These problems are soluble; they are difficult to solve. That is, they're difficult in terms of the amount of work, difficult in terms of the amount of political effort required, difficult in terms of the factional brawls required to solve the problem, but they are soluble.

Actually, although I didn't like FDR much in general ... at the outset of the war—and mind you it was a change in policy—FDR had a fight with Winston Churchill at Casablanca. FDR laid down to Churchill a policy which would have prevented the United States from getting into most of the economic and related messes which we have gotten into in the postwar period. Essentially I would say, from the standpoint of political reference, that what we need to do now is to do approximately 40 years late, or 35 years late, what FDR proposed the United States should have done in 1940. We can do it.

Let me lay out what has to be done. One of our problems is that we make economic analyses and evaluations using tools to figure out the national income statistics levels and so forth, tools that are wrong. According to the statistics, the United States has continued to be in a phase of economic growth. The United States has been, since approximately 1966-67, in a period of economic decay. One can say we have been in aggravated stagnation with some exceptions since approximately 1957-58. We made the wrong turn under Truman. Eisenhower tried to force things toward the right direction with his Atoms for Peace policy. Rogers threatened to do the same thing with his Rogers Plan policy, and even Jack Kennedy did the right thing—among many other things—with his position on tax breaks to foster some degree of capital intensive investment....

So it is correct to say, let's go back to what Roosevelt laid out in opposition to what Churchill proposed. At the Atlantic meeting and the Casablanca meeting, Roosevelt said the United States is not going to war to rescue the British Empire in any shape or form, or under any disguise, nor is the United States going to go to war and continue after the war supporting British "18th century methods" in terms of the relationship of the industrialized countries to the colonial and semicolonial sector. We are going to use American methods, that is, we are going to introduce high technology in agriculture and industrial development in the developing sector to create a self-expanding market for capital goods at the same time that we do what we should do as national political and associated policies in any region of the world—do what the United States did in its own territory: take its own population's