Who and What is Lyndon LaRouche?

You'll find them at airports and shopping centers selling newspapers and magazines. They're well-dressed and fast-talking. They plug economic growth and nuclear power. They denounce drugs, liberals and Ralph Nader. But appearances are deceiving. These conservative-looking and talking political salesmen are not conservatives—they're pro-Soviet.

They masquerade as representatives of the National Democratic Policy Committee, the New Solidarity International Press Service (NSIPS), the National Anti-Drug Coalition, the Fusion Energy Foundation and the Executive Intelligence Review. They used to operate as members of the National Caucus of Labor Committees (NCLC) and the U.S. Labor Party (USLP). All of these organizations lead to one man—Lyndon H. LaRouche Jr.

LaRouche, a former member of the Trotskyite Communist Socialist Workers party (SWP), emerged as the leader of a faction of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) in the late 1960s. He built his group into a political intelligence network with about one thousand operatives stationed in North America, Western Europe and South America. These operatives tirelessly and mindlessly promote the bizarre conspiracy theories of LaRouche, who ran as the USLP candidate for President in 1976 and campaigned for the Democratic nomination in 1980.

In a series of lectures given in 1976, "What Only Communists Know," LaRouche described his network as a part of the "world's Marxist labor movement" which together with "allied Communist forces within the capitalist sector generally are working on it, constantly, to bring about a new Marxist International..."

In that same year, however, LaRouche appeared to reverse course, ordering his followers to pursue "tactical alliances" with conservatives. LaRouche became critical of the drug lobby, the anti-nuclear movement, and "Zionist agents." Yet his supposed attacks on the left always seemed to result in attacks on responsible conservatives and Western intelligence agencies, diverting attention away from Soviet aggression.

In 1976, for example, the USLP published "Carter and the Party of International Terrorism," which purported to be a report on the links between liberal foundations, think tanks, the Institute for Policy Studies (IPS), law firms connected to the Democratic party and international and domestic terrorism.

The report claimed, among other things, that "Wall Street"—not Moscow—controlled international terrorism and the Communist Party, U.S.A. Another report, devoted to the Institute for Policy Studies, claimed that the CIA was responsible for 90 per cent of the world's terrorism and that Communists involved in terrorism were actually Western intelligence agents. The report also attacked anti-Communist Rep. Lawrence McDonald (R-Ga.), because he was pressing for an investigation of "alleged" KGB infiltration of Capitol Hill.

In 1979 Executive Intelligence Review published an article, "Who Are the Environmentalists?"

Despite the pro-Soviet line pursued by Lyndon LaRouche, U.S. Labor party presidential candidate, some conservatives have been taken in by his rhetoric, which claimed that the anti-nuclear movement was run by the New York-based Council on Foreign Relations and a London institute. But the article also attacked London Daily Telegraph columnist Robert Moss and Rep. McDonald for charging Soviet manipulation of the anti-nuclear movement in the West. Executive Intelligence Review labeled these charges as "wild conspiracy tales."

A 1978 book distributed by the USLP, Dope, Inc., an alleged expose of who controls the world's narcotics trafficking, curiously ignored the role of every Communist power except Red China in the dope trade. This is not surprising, since a Soviet commentator is cited as a source for some of the allegations made in the book.

Also of interest is how the LaRouche group reacted to The Spike, the best-selling novel about Soviet espionage and disinformation operations written by Robert Moss and former Newsweek correspondent Arnaud de Borchgrave. LaRouche said the book "promotes belief in a non-existent aspect of the Soviet KGB..." Another review of the book in their newspaper, New Solidarity, rejected the book's claim that the Soviet Union was a primary sponsor of international terrorism.

According to New Solidarity, the real sponsor is "Anglo-American intelligence," of which Robert Moss is supposed to be a member.

Last July New Solidarity published an interview with Gen. Nino Pasti, identified as a retired NATO military officer who was "to become a member of the Italian Communist parliament on the Communist party ticket." The general parrots the Soviet line on Afghanistan, saying that the Soviets invaded because NATO had decided to deploy new missiles in Europe and the U.S. and China were allegedly collaborating on military policy, "with a view toward an eventual war against the Soviet Union."

In a bizarre twist, LaRouche has been making what appear to be attacks on the Soviet KGB and Fidel Castro. These are appearing in New Solidarity, reports circulating on Capitol Hill, and a long letter that LaRouche sent to several key congressmen. Even these attacks, if designed to serve Soviet objectives. They are being made in connection with a smear of the Heritage Foundation, the respected Washington-based think tank that has placed many conservatives in the new Administration's KGB front. (Heritage published an excellent expose of the USLP in 1978.)

In a variation of a disinformation theme the CIA claims is used by the Soviets, LaRouche suggests a "faction" of the Soviet leadership that controls KGB, Fidel Castro, the Socialist International, and elements of Canadian intelligence are being manipulated by British agents in an effort to destabilize Poland, Central America and the Middle East. Dictator Brezhnev, we are told, is not part of that faction, however. Brezhnev is supposed to be a member of the "nationalist faction" that favors peace and trade and opposes war, terrorism and "world revolution."

The 1978 CIA Report on Soviet Propaganda Operations, prepared at the request of Rep. John Ashbrook (R-Ohio) of the House Select Committee on Intelligence, points out that the theme that there are "moderates" and "hardliners," or "hawks" and "doves" in the Kremlin, is frequently employed by the Soviets as a way of gaining diplomatic advantages from the West. As the CIA report notes, "If we grant that Brezhnev is a dove, then we must accommodate ourselves to his demands in order to encourage the more moderate elements in the Soviet leadership; moreover, we must expect that the deal Brezhnev offers us is the best we can expect to get from the Soviets."

A recent article in the Executive Intelligence Review, "Brezhnev Reasserts a War-Avoidance Policy," picks up on the disinformation theme directly, using some of the terminology mentioned in the CIA report. The article argues that the Reagan Administration must deal with Brezhnev, who represents "Soviet political forces which orient toward cooperation with the West," and not provoke "the Soviet anti-detente hardliners..."

The pro-Soviet line runs through most of the LaRouche operations, including the Fusion Energy Foundation and its publication, Fusion magazine. Fusion is strongly pro-nuclear, promoting development of fission and fusion energy. Yet an analysis of past issues of Fusion shows that much of its development in the fusion energy field has been pushed in conjunction with demands for (Continued on page 6)
EEOC Transition Team: End Affirmative Action

Opponents of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), who have long believed that agency was operating in direct violation of its statutory authority, have picked up important new support from the EEOC transition team headed by J. A. Parker, a black activist and chairman of the Washington-based Lincoln Institute.

Release of the team's findings may also influence the EEOC's future composition. Within weeks there will be two vacancies on the five-member commission. Since there will be one Republican-appointed vacancy, any new political support will allow President Reagan to appoint a Republican majority. The resignation of Eleanor Holmes Norton, a militant feminist appointed by Jimmy Carter, will make room for a new chairman as well.

It is crucial, in the view of many veteran Reagan supporters, that the President fill those posts with qualified individuals who are committed to implementing the transition team's recommendations.

Under Parker's direction, the transition team did a thorough analysis of the EEOC. Among its conclusions were:

• "The program of 'affirmative action' has been used by the EEOC and other government agencies to 'implement' the Civil Rights Act of 1964. That act does not contain the phrase 'affirmative action,' nor does any other piece of legislation. It originates, instead, in Executive Order 11246, signed by President Lyndon Johnson in 1964. The order's original nondiscriminatory intent was changed into a weapon to, in effect, endorse discriminatory hiring."

• The EEOC has not confined itself to fighting cases of individual discrimination brought by aggrieved individuals, which was its lawful purpose, but, rather, it has "placed the burden of proof on employers whose work forces did not divide into what the EEOC deemed the appropriate percentages for whites, blacks and other minorities." Such use of percentages was expressly forbidden by the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

• "A private sector advisory committee must be formed to insure sufficient input for those against whom many charges are filed."

• The EEOC has not defined itself to fighting cases of individual discrimination brought by aggrieved individuals, which was its lawful purpose, but, rather, it has "placed the burden of proof on employers whose work forces did not divide into what the EEOC deemed the appropriate percentages for whites, blacks and other minorities." Such use of percentages was expressly forbidden by the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Under Parker's direction, the transition team did a thorough analysis of the EEOC. Among its conclusions were:

• "The program of 'affirmative action' has been used by the EEOC and other government agencies to 'implement' the Civil Rights Act of 1964. That act does not contain the phrase 'affirmative action,' nor does any other piece of legislation. It originates, instead, in Executive Order 11246, signed by President Lyndon Johnson in 1964. The order's original nondiscriminatory intent was changed into a weapon to, in effect, endorse discriminatory hiring."

• The EEOC has not confined itself to fighting cases of individual discrimination brought by aggrieved individuals, which was its lawful purpose, but, rather, it has "placed the burden of proof on employers whose work forces did not divide into what the EEOC deemed the appropriate percentages for whites, blacks and other minorities." Such use of percentages was expressly forbidden by the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

• "A complete freeze on new guidelines and suits should be imposed for one year.

• President Reagan should appoint members who have a strong belief in the free enterprise system and who are steadfastly opposed to "discriminatory, since "a substantially disproportionate percentage of persons convicted of 'serious' crimes are minority group persons."

• As a result of its illegitimate stress on numbers rather than discriminatory intent, the EEOC has made it virtually impossible for employers to test the qualifications of prospective employees. It has even ruled that to take into account an individual's criminal record is racially discriminatory, since a substantially disproportionate percentage of persons convicted of serious crimes are minority group persons."

The overall effect of such twisted interpretations has been to place an intolerable burden on American business, especially small business.

The upshot, according to the transition team, is that "the EEOC, implementing the 1964 Civil Rights Act against racial and other types of discrimination, has created a new racism in America, in which every individual is judged by race and every employer must keep records on the basis of race, sex and other criteria." In order for the Reagan Administration to put an end to this travesty, the transition team recommended, among other things, that:

• The "entire philosophy of 'affirmative action' " be reconsidered.

• Intent to discriminate, rather than numerical percentages, must be the determining criterion of guilt.

• "Tests and biographical histories are to be considered a legitimate basis upon which to consider the merits of potential employees. The fact that members of one group score higher on particular tests than members of another group is not a sufficient basis for finding such tests to be discriminatory. Current testing guidelines must be reassessed and revised."

• A complete freeze on new guidelines and suits should be imposed for one year.

• President Reagan should appoint members who have a strong belief in the free enterprise system and who are steadfastly opposed to "discriminatory hiring."

• "A private sector advisory committee must be formed to insure sufficient input for those against whom many charges are filed."

Significantly, the transition report points out that, since the policies it recommends changing "are not found in any legal statutes but, instead, in administrative regulations, these can be altered in the same manner. Similarly, those policies which we find in error which are found in Executive Orders can be altered" by the President acting alone.

Reagan's Tough Line on Soviets

"I don't have to think of an answer as to what I think their intentions are. I know what sort of the Soviet Union since the revolution, including the present leadership, that has not, more than once, repeated in the various Communist congresses they hold their determination that their goal must be the promotion of world revolution and a one-world Socialist Communist state."

"Now as long as they have been and as long as they at the same time have openly and publicly declared that the only morality they recognize is that which would further their cause, meaning they reserve to themselves the right to commit any crime, to lie, to cheat, in order to attain that, and that is immoral, not moral."

"We operate on a different set of standards," said Reagan. "I think when you do business with them, even in detente, you keep that in mind."

Lyndon LaRouche

U.S.-USSR cooperation in nuclear research and development. Fusion also carries many articles and advertisements promoting East-West trade and U.S.-Soviet scientific exchanges.

For example, in June 1978 Fusion carried an article, "Brezhnev-Schmidt Treaty: Peace, Prosperity, Progress," that praised the huge economic deal signed by Brezhnev and West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt for promoting the "near integration of the two economies."

Fusion/Co., a service of Control Data Corp., which promotes and engages in technology transfer to the U.S.S.R., took out a full-page advertisement in Fusion in November 1978 revealing readers about a U.S.S.R. visit by four Soviet scientists who specialize in magnetohydrodynamics.

Despite the pro-Soviet line pursued by LaRouche and his assorted front organizations, some conservative groups have been taken in by the conservative-sounding rhetoric of the Conservative Book Club, for example, has taken out a number of advertisements in Fusion magazine. The ads plug the book, Grow Or Die, by James A. Weber. Last year, the prestigious Free- doms Foundation gave an award to Fusion for a series of pro- nuclear articles. After learning of Fu- sion's backers, however, the Freedoms Foundation acknowledged making a mistake and promised to change its awards selection procedure.

The biggest sucker, however, is the far-right Liberty Lobby and its publication, Spotlight, which share LaRouche's fascination with the Rockefeller and conspiracy theories. Spotlight favorably reviewed the USLP "Carter and Terrorism" report. It said although there were "occasional distortions and omissions" in the report, it was nevertheless a "valuable addition" to anyone's political library. The problem, according to Spotlight, was not the failure to document Moscow's role in terrorism, but the alleged failure to implicate "the major Zionist groups." Liberty Lobby sold copies of the report for $5, even though the USLP was selling it for $2. In 1979 Spotlight favorably reviewed the USLP book, Dope, Inc., describing it as "exceptionally well written, broad and informative." Liberty Lobby sold the book for $5.

Spotlight's opinion of the USLP apparently changed over the years. Back when they reviewed the "Carter and Terrorism" report, they said the USLP was "probably the only 'honest' Marxist group in the U.S. because it is not controlled by anyone's money."

"We operate on a different set of standards," said Reagan. "I think when you do business with them, even in detente, you keep that in mind."