To Francis Johns
Class Struggle indicated the Spark group's support for the Polish Solidarity movement. The October 1981 issue had an article on "Poland: What Lies Ahead for the Working Class?" commenting on the first (and only) congress of Solidarity. It commented that "the very existence of the Congress... demonstrated the democratic rights which the Polish workers had taken for themselves in this period. That the workers have sustained their organization so long and continued to extend their demands without falling back is remarkable."127

Subsequent to the suppression of Solidarity, Class Struggle carried an article on that event, which concluded that "As long as the enemies of the working class hold the power, that is, as long as they control the state apparatus and the army, the working class has no way to guarantee it can retain what it won by its struggles. . . . That is, the working class must fight for the one thing, for power, which is the guarantee that it can keep all the other things it has won."128

The position of the Spark Group on the (for Trotskyists) all-important issue of the nature of the Soviet Union was markedly different from that of virtually all other U.S. Trotskyist groups but similar to that of its French counterpart. They held that, since the Soviet Union was the only country which had had a genuine workers revolution in which the workers had seized control, it was the only case which could be labelled a degenerated workers state.129 As for the other Communist Party-controlled regimes, an editorial in Spark defined the situation by saying, "The workers were not involved in establishing these states, and these states do not represent the working class. Romania, like the rest of East Europe, is simply a bourgeois state, with a poorly developed economy. . . ."130

By mid-1982 the Spark Group had local units in Detroit, Chicago, and Baltimore and had recently established one in New York City. Internationally it was associated with the Lutte Ouvrière party in France.131

The Turner Group

The principal element in the opposition within the Spartacist League in the factional struggle of 1968 was led by Harry Turner. They left the SFL at the end of that year. Upon leaving the Spartacist League the Turner group explored the possibility of joining forces with one or another of the other groups claiming loyalty to Trotskyism. They first negotiated with the Workers League but were unable to reach agreement on a number of political points. They then joined forces with the SDS-Labor Committee, headed by Lyn Marcus (Lyndon LaRouche), which was then an open organization grouping together several different Trotskyist tendencies. However, after a short period they followed the Spartacist League and Workers League in withdrawing from the Marcus group. Shortly thereafter they established the Vanguard Newsletter (VL).132

In an early issue of the Vanguard Newsletter the group synthesized its political position. This statement said that "we in Vanguard Newsletter call for the building of an American section of the international Leninist and Trotskyist working class vanguard party on a program to unite the racially divided working class in struggle against all forms of special oppression, in its own immediate and fundamental interests and for the socialist revolution." The statement continued: "We call for the organization of rank and file or left-wing caucuses in the trade unions with this perspective incorporated into a comprehensive program of transitional demands. We believe that a network of such caucuses can develop into a leadership of the organized working class, can become at a revolutionary moment, workers' councils, 'Soviets', organs of 'dual..."
When the United States group expressed sympathy for the Spanish affiliate of FOR, which was purged by Munis and the international group, Munis responded in 1981 by expelling FOCUS from the international organization. FOCUS thereupon announced that “we will carry forward the banner of the FOR with or without the ‘official’ approval of Munis.”

Elsewhere in this volume we trace the evolution of the thinking of G. Munis and in particular his denunciation of the trade union movement as a brake on working class revolution. After their break with him the FOCUS group expressed their unhappiness with Munis’s failure to suggest an alternative to the majority trade union movements as a field in which revolutionaries could operate. In October 1983 they published an extensive analysis of this issue, concluding that “in the absence of a continuous forward dynamic within the class, such as will make the resolution of all these matters an immediate issue, we now propose that revolutionary-minded workers enter and seek to build the small anarcho-syndicalist organizations, the CNT and IWOB. These at least offer a history of opposition to the union bureaucracies. To the extent that these organizations have maintained the tradition of such opposition, they should be studied, supported and defended.”

By 1984 Stephen Schwartz had dropped out of the leadership of the FOCUS group. Its publication, The Alarm was transferred to Portland, Oregon, “because the FOCUS group here is largest and can put more effort into the magazine than the Bay Area folks.” The first issue published in Portland noted that “most of our members remain active in the IWW, a controversial move made at the beginning of 1984. For the most part our membership has been received positively by other wobblies, a number welcoming us heartily because of our revolutionary positions.”

The Proletarian Tasks Tendency
In the early 1980s there was still another small group established which proclaimed its basic loyalty to Trotskyism: the Proletarian Tasks Tendency. Its orientation was indicated by an editorial in the second issue of its periodical, Workers Review, which, after stating that “we are committed to the Transitional Program, the reconstruction of the world Trotskyist movement on a principled basis,” observed “We also believe that a major political problem within those organizations that call themselves Trotskyist or Communist is the tendency towards centralism and away from democracy.”

The Strange Case of the National Caucus of Labor Committees
Certainly the most peculiar offshoot of Trotskyism in the United States has been the so-called National Caucus of Labor Committees (NCLC). Originating in the mid to late 1960s as a dissident Trotskyist group, it had by the end of the next decade become an extreme right-wing organization.

Through all phases of its ideological and political evolution the National Caucus of Labor Committees minutely followed the changes in ideas, fantasies, and even delusions of its founder and leader Lyndon LaRouche, who until the mid-1970s called himself Lyn Marcus [a name presumably derived from Lenin and Marx]. His writing made up a large part of the organization’s publications, particularly its “theoretical” presentations. The NCLC also followed LaRouche in one of the things which differentiated it from virtually the whole radical movement—its peculiar preoccupation with sex and excrement resulting in a widespread use of scatological language, bordering on the obscene, both in its leaders’ and members’ public speaking and in the group’s written material.

LaRouche also set the pattern in establishing another characteristic of the NCLC, its frequent emphasis on violence. This emphasis was not confined to a theoretical use of violence as to-day use...
violence as a "road to power," but the day-to-day use of it to maintain discipline within its own organization and to seek to intimidate or destroy its political opponents.

Finally, LaRouche led the NCLC in a third unique feature of the group, its delusions of grandeur. These delusions went far beyond the characteristic belief of virtually all radical groups that their ideas and probably their organizations will ultimately win power and mold national and international society—as expressed, for instance, in the Fourth International’s claim to be “the Party of the World Socialist Revolution.” LaRouche and nclc pictured themselves as already being a major factor in national politics which would be able to seize power within a very few years and as having great influence within political parties and governments of Europe, the Middle East, Latin America, and the Far East.

Indeed, the National Caucus of Labor Committees was more completely the expression of one man than any other group which had its origins in International Trotskyism. Even Trotsky never demanded—and received—the degree of absolute subservience and conformity which LaRouche insisted on.

**Origins of the NCLC**

Lyndon LaRouche, Jr., was born into a family of Quaker dissidents in New Hampshire in 1922. During World War II he was first a conscientious objector, but then changed his mind and saw noncombatant military service in the China-Burma-India theater. He joined the Socialist Workers Party either in 1948 or 1949 and remained in it until 1966. Although he never became a major figure in the swp, as a secondary leader he opposed the expulsion of those who were to become the Spartacist League.

With the formation of the Workers League after the expulsion of Tim Wohlforth and his followers from the swp, Lyn Marcus joined its ranks for a few months. A Spartacist publication commented on this period that “Marcus and Wohlforth, during their collaboration ... claimed they were in the Iskra period, by which they meant they should act as brain-trusters for the rest of the left. This concept is a consistent pillar of Marxism, the contention that his claim to leadership rests on his being smarter than everybody else.”

After a few months, LaRouche-Marcus withdrew from the wt and joined the Spartacist League. He was reported to have broken with the Spartacists "over unanimous opposition to his position that the trouble with the Castroites was that Castro didn’t know enough Marxist economics to maneuver in the world market." Subsequently, Lyndon LaRouche gave a somewhat different version of his activities right after leaving the swp, writing that he “went through the process of attempting to salvage some remnants from the swp.” After leaving the Spartacist League LaRouche organized his own group, known then as the sds Labor Committee, constituting a faction within the Students for a Democratic Society. The group played a role in the leadership of the student uprising at Columbia University in 1968. However, the LaRouche group did not stay long within sds. They were said to have broken with it over their position in support of the New York City teachers’ strike in 1969. The sds generally opposed that strike and supported the “community control” program of those who opposed the walkout. Once outside of the sds the LaRouchites formally established the National Caucus of Labor Committees.

**The Statement of Founding Principles**

What was for half a decade or more to be the basic political document of the nclc, its Statement of Founding Principles, was officially accepted at a national conference in January 1971. It contained the peculiar mishmash of philosophical ideas, economic notions, and political prescriptions which was then characteristic of the Marcus-LaRouche group. It also underscored the highly
elitist approach to politics and essentially disparaging attitude toward the working class characteristic of the NCLC.

The statement consisted of twenty-five numbered points. The first five dealt with philosophical questions and contained the kind of idiosyncratic language which was becoming typical of LaRouche and his followers. For instance, point 3 said that "all the conceptions of human conscious thought, formal, logical reasoning included, are produced by a noetic, concept-creating process which determines the 'axioms'... of formal reasoning; but which axioms or formal reasoning is inherently incapable of providing or explaining. That the real foundations of human knowledge in this noetic process of mind can be uncovered only by a dialectical examination of the process by which whole systems of formal logic are exposed as fallacious and totally new world-conceptions produced.

Some points have a more or less familiar Marxist ring. However, others set forth clearly the group's highly elitist ideas. Point 11 says that "the central problem of human identity today is therefore the fact that the working class (as an economic class) is not capable of spontaneously becoming a political class for itself..." Point 12 goes on to say that "therefore, the political existence of the working class depends upon the intervention of an 'outside agency,' whose function is to bring the political (working) class for itself into being. The 'outside agency' can only be a social formation which has already attained an advanced approximation of the working class consciousness which the working class itself lacks. Only a handful of the capitalist intelligentsia is capable of fulfilling this decisive role..."

Point 13 elaborated further on this "revolutionary intelligentsia," which is "the embryonic representation of a new human species, a Promethean species which seeks to reproduce its own kind from the ranks of the working class...

Point 17 reached the logical conclusion of the previous positions, and without mentioning Lyndon LaRouche by name proclaimed his right to determine the NCLC ideas and activities. It said that "while the cadre organization must submit to the class interests of the potential political (working) class for itself, that means and demands insulating the vanguard organization from corrupting intrusions of reactionary (bourgeois) ideology dominant among working people generally, oppressed minorities, and radical students, etc., in a capitalist society. Realization of socialist conceptions means that alien political ideas have ipso facto no voting rights over the formulation of policy within the vanguard organization. It means that the less-developed consciousness of socialist principles must be subordinated to the most advanced consciousness within the organization."71

"Hegemony on the Left"

During its early years the NCLC put great emphasis on obtaining "hegemony" in left-wing U.S. politics. As early as 1970 it claimed that it was well on the way to this. The NCLC magazine Campaigner wrote that "the Labor Committees already know a thing or two about the process of struggle for left hegemony. Our organization has been developed under simultaneous assault by both the anarchist 'crazies' and Progressive Labor Party, and has not only survived but grown.... We did not defeat PLP by accident. Excepting the Black Panther Party, which is obviously a very special case, the National Caucus of Labor Committees has emerged to present third 'position' in the struggle for left-hegemony in the U.S. movement."

In the spring of 1973 Lyndon LaRouche decided to "destroy" the Communist Party. In an editorial in New Solidarity in April, entitled "Death of the CPUSA," he said that "readers will obtain a taste of our ruthlessness in the way we proceed to finish off the Communist Party." He said that the NCLC would "conduct the most ruthless mopping-up operation against each of its ragged for-
name pro-

These attacks on the CP were labelled "Operation Mop-Up" by LaRouche. Dennis King has described what happened: "According to participants, Mop-Up was efficiently organized. In most cases, isolated individuals or small groups were caught by surprise and overwhelmed. The flying squads often were brought from out of town—so their faces would not be recognized—and would leave town before the police could investigate. Former NCLC members remember it all with shame. 'We'd be ten against one,' said one NCLC defector, 'and the CP member we'd pound on would be some elderly guy.'"

This description is confirmed by NCLC sources. An "Extra" of New Solidarity on April 16, 1973, said that "a significant amount of CP-YWLI blood was spilled at Temple University in Philadelphia last Wednesday. . . ." It was reported that between April and September 1973 there were at least sixty assaults by NCLC people on members of the Communist Party and the SWP.

Some NCLC members were shocked by Operation Mop-Up, and apparently expressed their unhappiness. LaRouche savagely attacked them in a way which was becoming characteristic in the organization. In an internal bulletin of the group, he wrote that "I am going to make you organizers. . . . What I shall do is to expose to you the cruel fact of your sexual impotence. . . . I will take away from you all hope that you can flee the terrors of politics to the safety of 'personal life.' I shall do this by showing to you that your frightened personal sexual life contains for you such terrors as the outside world could never offer you."

"Deprogramming" and Other Paranoia

After Operation Mop-Up, LaRouche turned his followers' attention in another direction, bringing into play another strain of agitation and propaganda which was to become characteristic of the NCLC, paranoia. He suddenly developed the idea that the CIA was centering attention and resources on trying to penetrate the NCLC and was "programming" its leaders and members. Most notorious was the case of Chris White, who had been the NCLC's representative in Great Britain. LaRouche summoned White home and submitted him to a process of "deprogramming," which the NCLC widely publicized. This case was followed by the "deprogramming" of various other leaders and rank and file members of the NCLC. LaRouche claimed that he was the only one who knew how to carry out successful "deprogramming."

LaRouche, in explaining the kind of "programming" to which NCLC people had been exposed, said that "the victim's sense of reality is turned inside out . . . in the dozen cases . . . known to have been brainwashed for the CIA or LEAA, the victim characteristically accused the Labor Committees of having brainwashed its members. . . ."

LaRouche claimed that the "programming" was part of a world-wide plot. He said that "we are now in the second phase of a psy-war game designed by the CIA, that is, a psychological warfare game conducted on a scale of four continents, in which the CIA is playing psychological warfare with an organization, the Labor Committee . . . ." He added that "there was, but that's not relevant, an assassination plot against me by the KGB."

Although the publicity about LaRouche's "deprogramming" of NCLC members was soon dropped, both the paranoia about persecution of LaRouche and of the NCLC continued to be an article of faith, and LaRouche's own psychological methods to combat it continued. The New York Times reported in October 1979 that "the party's founder has conducted grueling encounter sessions to keep members in line. According to the accounts of former members, those who doubt Mr. LaRouche are summoned before a small group and grilled about their fears.
and guilt until they break down. Husbands or wives are asked about their partners' sexual practices. "80

The paranoia continued. For instance, in July 1977, New Solidarity carried an article headlined "Carter Caught Redhanded in Cointelpro vs. USLP," that is, an espionage plot against the U.S. Labor Party, then the public face of the NCLC.81 In October 1978 the same newspaper had an article headlined "Zionists' Assassination Threat on LaRouche is Put on Front Burner."82

The "Intelligence Network"

In September 1971 the NCLC first established its "intelligence network." This was a unique organization in which members of the group channeled information to the NCLC headquarters from all over the United States, and subsequently from Europe and Latin America. The national organization then distributed this information through a series of publications, and through "briefings." It is not entirely clear just who attended these "briefings," although there was mention in the NCLC press of daily meetings of the group's National Committee at which members were told of information the Intelligence Network had acquired.

Early in 1975 in a document entitled A Fact Sheet: What Are the Labor Committees), the NCLC claimed that "Labor Committee Intelligence has always functioned in the way the research departments of a major news service should function. . . . This fact-gathering capability is supplemented with currently increasing importance, by information contributed from workers and others associated with the day-to-day activities of the Labor Committees and Labor Party." 83

The NCLC claimed special competence for its news gathering. The same document said that "in the process of cumulative research into current political developments and related strategic matters, our intelligence work has aggregated special competence in respect to the behind-the-scenes processes largely governing the explicit activities of governments."83

As one who was upon occasion approached and provided with NCLC "intelligence" about Latin American countries, the author can testify that these "inside stories" were more often than not flights of fancy rather than inside information.

The LaRouche-NCLC Economic-Social Program

In the mid-1970s Lyndon LaRouche and the NCLC put forward a global economic and social program which they never entirely abandoned. It consisted principally of their proposal for an International Development Bank, the establishment of a "transferable" as a new world currency, and fusion power as a solution to all the world's energy problems.

They published their world economic program as a pamphlet, IDB: How the International Development Bank Will Work, and elaborated on it endlessly in their press. An article by Criton Zoakes, "NCLC Director of Intelligence," proclaimed that "there is absolutely not one single solitary alternate road for putting the world economy together again except the way we've described."84

The NCLC explained their proposed International Development Bank as bringing together the tremendous productive possibilities of the industrial countries and the great development needs of the poor nations: "Formally, the IDB comes into existence in a manner analogous to the effective financial reorganization of any major bank being rescued from illiquidity collapse. A new bank is created to continue the essential operations of the old, while major categories of unpayable carried-forward indebtedness are placed in a moratorium 'deep freeze' and negotiations for future liquidation of that debt are conducted separately from day-to-day operations of the new institution."85

The idea of a debt moratorium for the developing countries became a permanent part of their proposals for a reorganization of the world economy that was not based on the existing "dollar" since it, as a fact, is exchangeable from Western countries. A Third World transferable currency. A side issue that is essential to a new world economic order.

The LaRouche-NCLC third world economic program became a permanent part of their proposals for a reorganization of the world economy that was not based on the existing "dollar" since it, as a fact, is exchangeable from Western countries. A Third World transferable currency. A side issue that is essential to a new world economic order.
part of the "program" of the NCLC, but, they did not continue to emphasize the idea.

More idiosyncratic was LaRouche's proposal for a "transferable ruble" as a new world currency. Criton Zoakes described this by saying that "when we establish the transferable ruble standard as a reserve currency, it will create with this flow of trade from Western Europe into Eastern Europe a transferable ruble surplus into Western Europe. At the same time it creates a transferable ruble indebtedness of Third World countries to the Comecon. Now Western Europe still continues to require commodity and raw materials imports from the Third World for which it pays with its surplus transferable rubles. Thus it provides the Third World countries the means with which to pay their obligations to the Comecon sector."86

This description is not so markedly different from the way in which the "transferable dollar" has functioned as a world currency since World War II. The major problem with it, as a practical proposition, of course, is the fact that the Soviet ruble has never been "transferable," and there has been no indication that the pre-Gorbachev Soviet Union leadership has ever considered the possibility of allowing free purchase and sale of their national currency.

The third element in the socioeconomic program of LaRouche and the NCLC was emphasis on atomic power. It particularly emphasized the possibilities of "fusion power," a kind of nuclear energy which in theory is exceedingly productive and "clean," but which is only in the early development stage. The NCLC organized a Fusion Energy Foundation with the purpose of pushing this particular panacea, and much of the public attention the NCLC received came from its members at airports and other transport centers who distributed and sold literature supporting atomic energy.

The NCLC Conspiracy Mania

By the mid-1970s Lyndon LaRouche—and therefore, the NCLC—had developed an extensive conspiracy theory of history. The objective of the conspiracy, according to them, was to dominate the world, or to destroy it if control was impossible. The details of the conspiracy were developed by LaRouche over a number of years.

Dennis King explained the fully developed LaRouche conspiracy theory (as of 1983): "He claimed that an evil 'oligarchy'—a conspiratorial elite of usurers opposed to industrial or scientific progress—emerged in ancient Babylon (at the time of the Jewish captivity) and molded the Jewish religion into a 'cult' to be employed as its fifth column. This oligarchy—the 'Whore of Babylon'—supposedly set itself apart from humanity, developed a cosmopolitan anti-human tradition, shifted its headquarters to the West, and conspired through the centuries to achieve global dominance."87

King adds that "in the era of capitalism, the oligarchy allegedly moved to London. Under the leadership of the Rothschilds, and using the Churchill family and the Free Masons as its cover, it subverted the English aristocracy. It then concocted the 'cult' of Zionism to supplement Judaism as an international tool."88

For a number of years the NCLC claimed that Nelson Rockefeller was the center of the worldwide conspiracy. The extent to which this argument went was shown in a lead article in the January 5, 1978, issue of New Solidarity. It started by noting that "in the last forty-eight hours, the populations of Northern Europe and sections of the East bloc... have been hit with the worst storm in Europe in twenty-nine years." The article went on to assert that "only Rockefeller, Kissinger, and their National Security Council apparatus have the motive, capability, and opportunity to carry out such an insane outrage as this against the working people of Western Europe and of the East bloc."89

Later, LaRouche dropped Nelson Rockefeller as the focus of his conspiracy theory, and denounced President Jimmy Carter. Typical of the NCLC statements in this pe-
period was one of Bruce Todd, the NCLC-U.S. Labor Party candidate for Congress in the 15th District of New Jersey, who was quoted in October 1976 as saying that "if Jimmy Carter is elected, the United States will be in a thermonuclear war with the Soviet Union within six to seven months after his inauguration." Of course, this, like most of the LaRouche-NCLC confident predictions of future disasters, did not come to pass. These failures were usually explained on the basis of the NCLC having prevented them by announcing their likelihood. Typical was a throwaway of the U.S. Labor Party entitled "Kissinger Unleashes Terrorists on United States," which commented that "You know about Kissinger's and Rockefeller's bloody schemes to start a nuclear war... Kissinger and Rockefeller tried this operation once before in January 1974. At that time, the U.S. Labor Party's mass inoculation against U.S. terror operations forced them to pull back...."

It has been frequently argued that anti-Semitism is the underlying theme of the LaRouche-NCLC conspiracy theory developed in the 1970s. There were certainly frequent references to Jewish bankers, not necessarily identified explicitly as Jews, as evil figures of the past and present. There were also many attacks on "Zionists" under circumstances which might as well read "Jews." Open appeals to antipathy against Jews were relatively rare. Nonetheless, there were sometimes such anti-Semitic outbursts. For example, in an article dealing with supposed espionage of the Federal government against the NCLC, Costa Kalimtgis wrote in 1977 that "NBC, which is owned by 'Our Crowd' investment houses (Lehman Bros, Goldman Sachs, Kuhn-Loeb of the Schiff-Warbourg group, and Lazard Freres), and whose Board of Directors were large contributors and backers of the Carter campaign, were scheduling a half-hour slander program on the U.S. Labor Party...."

This clash with the National Broadcasting Company had interesting results. Lyndon LaRouche lodged a suit for $170 million in Federal District Court in Alexandria, Virginia, on the claim that NBC had "defamed" him. LaRouche lost that suit, but NBC was awarded $3 million in a countersuit which "charged that people in the organization of Mr. LaRouche interfered with NBC's news-gathering while the network was preparing reports on him." The United States Labor Party

For a number of years the NCLC worked through the U.S. Labor Party as its electoral vehicle. They ran numerous local candidates, and in 1976 Lyndon LaRouche himself was the party's presidential nominee. They claimed to believe that he would be elected. New Solidarity said that "the ballot strategy is to conduct petition drives in the twenty states where the Labor Party is strongest, and in ten contiguous, populous states where the Party has extensive penetration... The twenty states where the Labor Party local offices are now located comprise about three-fourths of the U.S. population and account for fifty-four percent [289] of the Electoral College vote. The additional ten target states represent another fifty-six Electoral College votes, bringing the target total electoral votes to 345. A total of 270 Electoral College votes is required to win the Presidency and Vice Presidency." Once the election was over, LaRouche and his followers made two claims: that they had gotten a larger vote than any other left-wing candidate in U.S. history, and that Gerald Ford and not Jimmy Carter had won the election. Their "analysis" of the election results claimed that LaRouche had received 3,500,000 votes, rather than the 18,500 votes with which he had been officially credited. In New York State it was claimed that LaRouche had received 384,000 votes rather than the official 1,727. Charging "fraud" in the election count, the NCLC said that...
the present parading of Jimmy Carter as the President-Elect is a patently fraudulent act being carried out by the three major television networks and the two wire services. . . . This *New Solidarity* article modestly promised that if Gerald Ford should choose . . . to not seek the Presidency . . . LaRouche, in the interest of national security and national unity, announced at the same time his willingness to avail himself as a candidate for President-Elect in case Dole also chooses not to ask for the Electoral College vote."96

Almost two years after the 1976 election, LaRouche, still billed as the Chairman of the U.S. Labor Party, claimed a major role for the party in U.S. politics. He said that "the U.S. Labor Party declares the de facto existence of a new political leadership in the United States. We propose to name this new leadership the *American Whig Policy Coalition*. The Coalition will include the U.S. Labor Party, of course, but will also include Republicans, Democrats, and independents, which, as a combination, will determine who is President of the U.S. in January 1981."97

The National Democratic Policy Committee (NDPC)

In spite of aligning himself with the far right Republicans in the campaign to annul the results of the 1976 election, in 1979 LaRouche and the NCLC switched their tactics. They buried the U.S. Labor Party, established instead the National Democratic Policy Committee, and decided to work inside the Democratic Party. In the 1980 election LaRouche ran in fourteen Democratic state primaries. The NCLC raised enough money in that campaign to qualify for $326,000 in matching funds from the Federal Election Commission, a body which LaRouche and the NCLC had violently denounced four years before.98

During the 1980 campaign the NCLC and LaRouche indicated that they had not changed their nature. LaRouche "contended that he was the target of an international conspiracy to kill him." When his people left New Hampshire, a "New Hampshire Target List" was found in the motel room of one of LaRouche's campaign workers including the names of mayors and city clerks of several New Hampshire cities and towns, and other people, with the notation, "These are the criminals to burn—we want calls coming in to these fellows day and night—use your networks to best advantage." Attorney General Rath, one of those on the list, commented: "That would be consistent with the calls I received. I got about 50 home calls on Sunday. . . . Some of the callers said, 'We know where you live,'."99

Two and a half years later, the National Democratic Policy Committee received publicity in the May 1985 local school board election in New York City, where it ran candidates in several districts. Both the *New York Times*100 and Albert Shanker, president of the American Federation of Teachers, urged the voters not to support the group.101 Early in 1984 the NDPC ran a number of school board candidates in New Jersey. They were all defeated overwhelmingly. In Piscataway, where there were originally only two candidates running for three posts and the LaRouche group's nomination of two additional ones would have assured the election of one, a write-in campaign brought victory of the write-in nominee by three-and-a-half to one over the leading LaRouche nominee.102

In the 1984 general election LaRouche again sought the Democratic nomination. He received $185,000 in matching funds from the Federal Electoral Commission. After the primary campaign LaRouche ran as an "independent Democrat," getting on the ballot in nineteen states.103 He was officially credited with having gotten 78,773 votes.104

A New Jersey political commentator, Tom Hester, noting the presence of LaRouche's candidates in that state, observed
about the recent evolution of the group's ideas that "the movement runs on an odd blend of political dogma. It warns of a corporate-Marxist conspiracy to control the world while criticizing the Polish Solidarity effort. Last year it locked onto Republican President Ronald Reagan's 'Star Wars' proposal for the development of laser beam technology to blow away incoming Soviet missiles and has become its major proponent. LaRouche believes the Holocaust was a hoax."

Hester went on, "Eliot Greenspan, 34, of Haworth, the NDPC's New Jersey coordinator, is running as a Beam Technology Democrat for the U.S. Senate against Sen. Bill Bradley, D-NJ. The NDPC has candidates in eight of New Jersey's 14 congressional races. Last year the group ran on the 'Beam Technology: Stop War, Ban Depression' ticket in the Democratic legislative primary. One of its assembly candidates won the primary by default in Somerset when the county Democratic Party failed to field a candidate to oppose him." By 1985, the newspaper of the LaRouche group, New Solidarity, was carrying on its banner the description, "Nonpartisan National Newspaper of the American System." The LaRouche group suffered at least one small split. This took place in 1974. A small group called Centers for Change, describing itself as a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist organization and led by Fred Newman, joined the NCLC. But two months later Fred Newman resigned from the LaRouche group, subsequently forming the International Workers Party. Soon after quitting the NCLC Newman published a pamphlet, A Manifesto on Method, in which he commented that "from the very beginning of our contact with comrades of the ICLC [in October 1973] we have worked hard to change that organization while respecting its historically just claim to Hegemony. The former workers of CPC and the ICLC who founded the International Workers Party [IWP] take proper pride in the principled manner in which this struggle was conducted—frequently in the face of substantial personal abuse." There is no information available about the subsequent evolution of the IWP.

Conclusions About National Caucus of Labor Committees

It would appear that an individual or social psychologist could best describe and explain the National Caucus of Labor Committees and its leader, Lyndon LaRouche. It is in many ways unique in its evolution not only away from orthodox Trotskyism, but from Trotskyism of any kind. Although in the United States and many other countries there have been many individuals who after leaving the Trotskyist ranks became conservatives or even reactionaries, no other Trotskyist group as such had this kind of trajectory. More then any other Trotskyist faction, it degenerated into a sect or "cult," completely subordinate to, and dedicated to the exaltation of a particular individual, its founder, Lyndon LaRouche.

Conclusion

It is clear that the groups in the United States which have had their roots—however tenuously—in International Trotskyism have evolved in diverse directions. A few of these have remained more or less loyal to the ideas expressed by Leon Trotsky, quarreling more with fellow Trotskyists than with Trotsky himself. Others, however, have taken positions as diverse as a more or less clear alignment with the heirs of Stalin, an association with anarchosyndicalism, and a move totally across the political spectrum from the far left to the far right.