

then, we sacrificed some of our credibility when we condemned somebody else going in. I think we've either got to be against aggressive acts all over the place, not just aggressive acts by certain people. Perhaps it is naive, but either you're going to go around killing people all the time when you disagree with them or you're going to establish some basis of trust and accommodation. This we have managed to do in Europe. We have managed to do it in our economic relations, and we have managed to make some progress with strategic arms limitation talks. My feeling is that if you're going to limit your military responses, which I think the American people have decided to do, you've got to be more aggressive with your diplomatic approaches. We have done this and done it very well in the Middle East and we have done it I think and done it very well in Southern Africa.

Q: But what makes you think that United Nations sanctions are helpful. You're going to force the South African whites, who already have a defensive mentality, further in on their own resources particularly their own military resources.

A: Well a few days ago I was in our Orange Free State, the black belt of Alabama. This was the part of the United States where 10 years ago people were saying "never". It was in fact economic sanctions that when strictly and swiftly applied brought about change — when the black community said that either we will all profit together or we will all go down together. It was amazing how quickly people began to realize that the system of capitalism accommodates change, and that when you included blacks in the economy it didn't take anything away from whites. In fact it brought about an economic boom in our south land. We now talk about the southern part of the United States as the sun belt — it's the growth region of a nation. The sun's always been here, the thing that's different, the thing that has brought about the tremendous economic boom in this region, is that blacks and whites are no longer fighting each other. They are working together and we have a fantastic climate of economic development and prosperity for everybody. I think that Southern Africa, South Africa, Rhodesia is a potential sun belt — once they begin to deal with their problems together rather than blaming their problems on one another or on the Communists or on the United States.

Crush The British Bukharinite Snakes

The following analysis was released on May 24 by U.S. Labor Party Chairman Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Over the past week, a subversive British faction within the Soviet leadership has surfaced with the sole purpose of destroying the historic Schmidt-Brezhnev and Lopez Portillo-Brezhnev agreements for ending the threat of war with world economic development. The British mode of operation is precisely the same as that which destroyed the Zhukov-Eisenhower agreement on Atoms for Peace, precisely the same as that which destroyed the 1970 "Rogers Plan" for peace in the Middle East. The British Bukharinite snakes, Henry Kissinger, and their masters in Great Britain are up to their same treacherous tricks.

The occasion of their game this time is the highly commendable surgical operation by French President Giscard against the British-Belgian provocations in Zaire. Giscard's action was in complete consonance with the agreements made by West German Chancellor Schmidt and Brezhnev in Bonn on May 6 to ensure stability and peace throughout the developing and advanced sectors through the transfer of high-technology industry. My commendation of that action is not at all to be confused with the praise of the American "Philby" Henry Kissinger or the London Daily Telegraph.

As in 1970, the British Tories have feigned support for the French action, vociferously lying that it is part of their NATO strategy to run the Soviet Union out of the Third World. As in 1970, the British Labour Party, typified by Foreign Minister David Owen, have taken up the line of self-righteous opposition to "American imperialism." As in 1970, the British-linked Bukharinite snakes in the Soviet Union have turned to the right, screaming that Brezhnev's allies in France have "be-

come neocolonialist" and "sold out the working class."

These Bukharinite snakes are being run by the McCleans, the Philbys, the Arbatovs. Too weak to oppose the historic shift of President Brezhnev in his Bonn and Moscow agreements directly, they are mobilizing the most backward "proletkult" tradition within the Soviet Union to wreck this basis for world peace. Their assignment is war provocations — they will not stop at provoking incidents with China, in Africa, or anywhere else.

If Brezhnev is serious about his peace initiatives, he must move at once to crush these British Bukharinites. If not, we are headed irrevocably for World War III.

America too has its Philby. His name is Henry Kissinger. It has been his assignment to destroy the ability of the Carter Administration to join the Schmidt-Brezhnev-Portillo agreement. At Britain's behest he has praised Giscard; through CIA Director Turner and National Security Council staffer David Aaron, circulated lies about how Carter is about to wage war against Angola; brazenly lied about so-called Cuban and Soviet involvement with Katangese tribesmen whom all Europe knows have been trained by Belgium and London's NATO.

My advice to President Brezhnev and President Carter is this. Designate appropriate persons in the State Department, and their opposite numbers in the Soviet Union, to arrange a business meeting immediately. Set the agenda for this meeting firmly: the British Bukharinite agents must be cleaned out.

In the sense that Kissinger is playing the Tory counterpoint to the Soviet faction's Labourites, those who call Henry Kissinger a Soviet agent are right. Like the Bukharinites in the Soviet Union, he is playing a pure British wrecking operation. He must also be crushed.