Mr. Baker has given the National Caucus of Labor Committees (NCLC) this opportunity to respond to his April issue’s “analysis” of our organization. In preparing his article Mr. Baker relied solely upon self-admitted, bitter enemies of the NCLC. Many of those cited, and their immediate periphery, either stand convicted of criminal actions against the NCLC or are defendants in legal cases now being processed. Their charges range from slander to numerous instances of assault, kidnapping, and behavior modification.

A direct response to this pastiche of accumulated slanders would be a waste of valuable time now, as at least their prototypes have been fully treated when first circulated months and years ago. Instead, we present the following programmatic proposal by Lyndon H. LaRouche (a/k/a “Lyn Marcus”), founder of the NCLC and Presidential candidate on the U.S. Labor Party ticket. At this time the NCLC and its counterparts in Europe, Latin America and Asia have become a catalytic agent, mobilizing mass forces to actualize these proposals.

The primary counter-strategy adopted by the intelligence agencies of these sectors has been a coordinated attempt to contain the Labor Committees’ (LC) explosive influence. Among the “dirty-tricks” employed has been to plant slanders in the public domain for naïve others to reify (as we now assume was the case with Mr. Baker). Careful reading of the following document should allow “Homefront” readers to form their own opinion of the LC. Any reader who remains honestly confused by the stock-in-trade slanders of these counterinsurgency agents can contact the LC at the address which follows this article.

AN OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESS

By Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

During these few remaining weeks of spring the world is threatened by two looming horrors which define this immediate period as the most perilous in the world’s recorded history. At this moment we are confronted by imminent general economic chaos and a very high probability of thermonuclear holocaust.

No reasonable, informed leading political or military figure could sincerely argue that I exaggerate either of these immediate threats to humanity.

As my organization’s Financial Intelligence Unit has documented the case, the entire capitalist sector of the world is currently suffering the highest general illiquidity ratios since the so-called “great crisis” of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Without resorting to the wildest, hyper-inflationary use of the monetary printing presses, it will be impossible to roll over the aggregate mass of debt-service payments and debt maturities converging upon second quarter mid-term points of crisis. Without drastic means to effect orderly debt moratoria, a wave of defaults must erupt creating unprecedented degrees of financial anarchy and economic chaos in production and trade.

At the same time, principally because of the critical world financial situation, certain hegemonic currents within NATO are driving toward a 1962-type of thermonuclear showdown with the Soviet Union. We cannot be charged with baseless alarmism. The situation is so critical that politically conservative NATO military and political agencies have directly corroborated our analysis and warning on this point. These agencies have not suddenly elected to make a political bloc with a socialist organization; they represent politically conservative patriots motivated by a concern to prevent the thermonuclear obliteration of their countries.

We do not accuse the RAND Corporation, Brookings Institution, and Secretary Schlesinger of intending to bring about thermonuclear destruction of the U.S.A. and Western Europe. No doubt, as their published statements indicate, they believe they have some diabolically clever computer print-out scheme for forcing the Soviet Union to make a major strategic capitulation under threat of “new strategic options” proposed by RAND, et al. The point at issue is that in the face of the kind of confrontation being threatened, Soviet leaders are left with no reasonable option but to go to war. That latter is our estimation, is the estimation of authoritative professionals within NATO, and is clearly, even redundantly signalled from the Warsaw Pact agencies . . .

We summarily examine each case. The possibility of a thermonuclear confrontation over the Near East would be activated by an Israeli pre-emptive strike. This action would not occur because of any general Israeli desire for such actions. On the contrary, Soviet offers to guarantee Israel’s 1967 borders intersect a growing, impassioned desire among leading Israelis for an immediate durable settlement in that region. An Israeli strike would occur only through outside intervention into Israeli affairs to tip the political balance in favor of the extreme war-hawk factions.

The crucial point of confrontation in the Near-East would appear as an Israeli strike was broadened to threaten the integrity of Iraq and other Soviet Arab allies. This includes, of course, use of tactical nuclear strike capabilities by Israel and possibly Egypt . . .

NCLC Response to IAD

The second hot point is the Balkans, with Yugoslavia (and the Trieste region) in the forefront and Romania a secondary option. At this point, the death or “destabilizing” assassination of President Tito is generally assumed by NATO experts to be the trigger for a chain of events leading to confrontation. Again, one must inquire—what is the credible NATO interest in making the Balkans a point of brinksmanship at this time?

We emphasize again that there is a concerted drive to
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ward such confrontations by NATO political factions identified with RAND, Brookings and Secretary Schlesinger.

Perhaps there are within that faction some drunken madmen who as individuals might psychotically desire to bring the issue to the actual point of war—perhaps in the mood of "After me, the deluge." However, to the extent that there is a semblance of rationality in that faction as a whole, the objectives of this hideous caper must be located at a point short of actual thermonuclear warfare.

The direct and circumstantial evidence to be considered is overwhelming. The confrontation faction is plainly targeting two objectives short of actual warfare. The most obvious objective is to bully the Soviet Union into a self-imposed drastic weakening of its combined political and military strategic defense capabilities. Such objectives have been explicitly outlined by Schlesinger and other advocates of the "counterforce" and "limited nuclear warfare" innovations. The second objective is the destruction of major political institutions within the industrialized capitalist sector, institutions which presently represent a weakened but still powerful obstacle to the extreme forms of Schachtian austerity programs which would be required to roll over major categories of indebtedness. This second objective of a "successful" showdown can be properly identified as a general "destabilization" of constituency-oriented political parties and institutions throughout Western Europe and North America (in particular).

To fully understand the thermonuclear war danger, it is essential to briefly consider this prospect through Soviet eyes. On the most obvious level, the Soviets would be forced to contemplate a drastic setback to their political and military strategic defense posture, rendering their sector acutely more vulnerable to future confrontations. This alone would be sufficient provocation to make actual thermonuclear holocaust probable. However, the situation from the Soviet side is much worse. If the Soviets believed that a present nuclear showdown was a temporary aberration within NATO, then concessions to bullying might be at least moot. However, if such concessions are demanded by NATO regimes embarked on extreme forms of Schachtian austerity, the Soviets are forced to make strategic parallels between Nelson A. Rockefeller and Adolph Hitler. They must—and will—assume that the internal policy effects of Schachtian economics within NATO will aggravate the drive toward war within the capitalist sector. Under those two circumstances, a Soviet pre-emptive response to thermonuclear confrontation becomes the lesser of the two evils to be weighed.

A general strike against all major NATO concentrations in Western Europe and North America, accompanied by an immediate military occupation of Western Europe, eastern Turkey, etc., becomes the only option for Soviet leaders. This is an estimate generally corroborated by highly qualified military opponents of RAND, Brookings and Schlesinger within NATO.

Obviously, the present drive toward war must be halted directly. The most effective means for accomplishing this is to bring the debate over strategic policy to general public notice. That requires a concerted effort by Congressmen and others to break through the blackout of these facts effected by the accomplices of horror effectively controlling major news services and media. The collaboration of the major news services and certain major media in creating a "controlled political environment" for the people of North America and Western Europe must be ended, in any case. The complicity of such agencies in making politically possible "counterforce" brinksman-ship represents the point and issue at which this ugly use of press for psychological political manipulation must be immediately ended.

The mass of working people, farmers, and so forth of North America and Western Europe absolutely will not tolerate the Schlesinger policy—provided the facts are made known to them.

Although Congress must bring the madmen to account, something more fundamental is required if we are to permanently remove the danger of thermonuclear extinction. Just as it is the enormity of the impending economic collapse which has impelled certain leading factions of NATO to actualize the previously unthinkable, so we must remove the cause for such desperate adventurism from the world economy.

The present critical situation of New York City is exemplary of the general problems before us. Either we immediately effect an orderly financial reorganization of the U.S. dollar sector or before the end of June we face a spiralling process of defaults and collapse of employment and public services leading quickly into economic chaos throughout the capitalist sector as a whole. There must be an emergency program for orderly suspension of major categories of public and private indebtedness, a program which also maintains the functional integrity of essential financial administrative institutions, or we shall immediately confront such anarchy as most of us have never before imagined.

The basic measures so indicated must be supplemented by immediate determination to establish a new international monetary system replacing the bankrupt International Monetary Fund, World Bank, and so forth. The objective basis for such a new institution exists in the political readiness of both the developing sector and the Comecon sector to enter into major treaties concerning world trade and economic development. Provided these treaties ensure the resumption of levels of production and exports from the industrialized sector to large surplus positions, those surpluses afford the objective basis for sufficient new liquid credit to both forestall general economic collapse and to actually reach quickly levels of output exceeding high points of the 1960s.

By so providing the world with a basis for sound economic development we shall substantially reduce the incentives for desperate actions by crisis-maddened leading factions.

Humanity is now at a branch-point in its entire history. Either we seize the options of a new international monetary system or, within possibly as short a term as months or even weeks, civilized humanity may cease to exist.

Any who desire more information on the above proposals and what they can do to help actualize them should consult the NCLC Directory reprinted in the April issue of "Homefront" or contact the NCLC's National HQ at: P.O. Box 1972/GPO/NYC, NY/10001/Phone Number, 279-5950.
Shaping Up
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tion Bank which apparently was described in an earlier proposal. Another, warning of an imminent economic collapse, viewed the “rigged 400% increase in the price of oil” as temporarily strengthening the dollar; called for a general debt moratoria and a new monetary system to get the world on keel. A third proposes to bring peace to the Middle East with the U.S. underwriting the cost of a massive agricultural development and reconstruction program. It would forbid the U.S. to supply arms or military training to any country in the Middle East, of course, Israel.

In a proposal offered early this year the NCLC called for a moratorium on railroad debt service; elimination of the ICC and placing rails under a new Department of Transportation, apparently without actually nationalizing them. A bill much promoted last winter to meet the threat of a failure of the 1975 U.S. spring crop planting would have established a moratorium on U.S. farm debt, and focused much national resource into producing farm machinery, fertilizer and mandated 15-year imprisonment for anyone violating provisions of the proposed Emergency Agricultural Production Act. Obviously the NCLC theorists share with the Right the belief that punishment is a deterrent.

Readers can secure copies of the individual programs by contacting the NCLC, as its spokesman suggests. (See pg. 32. Those who read HOMEFRONT are not likely to accept either the NCLC’s premises or solutions. The significance of the programs to me is not in their details but in the fact that there are many of them.

Like the Birchers, the “LC’s” are obviously convinced that a master conspiracy is manipulating world and national events. Unlike the Birchers, they appear to be developing a master plan for America and for the universe.

BUCKLEY—CONSERVATIVE OR (CENSORED)?

If unpersuaded by William F. Buckley, Jr.’s, stern insistence that what he represents is true conservatism, be careful about the way you express your views in writing. Buckley, using his well-circulated column, dripping polysyllabic erudition, regularly denigrates those who view themselves as liberals or middlegrounders. But he just might sue you if you denigrate him. Look what he is doing to Dr. Franklin H. Littell.

Of course you, like Dr. Littrell, may ultimately be vindicated in Court. However, unless you can afford to write off your attorney fees like they were in the cost of an expensive hobby, you have about the same chance of emerging with a whole skin as a man of modest means who mixes with the high spenders in a no limit poker game.

Buckley sued Macmillan and Dr. Littell for being described as the “outstanding representative of the function of fellow traveler with respect to fascism in the United States,” in Littell’s book, Wild Tongues. Macmillan withdrew the book and settled out of court. That gave Buckley vindication.

Buckley’s attorneys kept after Littell anyway. When he ran out of money to pay his legal fees, Dr. Littell dispensed with his attorneys, and defended himself. Now he faces the hard decision on whether to appeal the $7,501 libel judgment.

Since the money involved can hardly mean much to Buckley, one can only speculate what’s in it for him. Does he simply want to intimidate the opposition? Does he figure that by keeping Littell in court he is keeping him out of print?

FROM THE BEGINNING, Buckley viewed IAD and its supporters darkly.

Before Wild Tongues was written he told his readers that IAD was intent on carrying out “the old-time purpose of creating an amalgam by which the worst is allowed to contaminate the least in order to score polemical points off the conservative opposition.”

Buckley’s National Review once called for a Congressional investigation of IAD, a McCarthyite-thrust if there ever was one.

After Major Bundy saturated Dr. Littell’s college community with incredible tirades against him, Buckley took IAD to task for exposing the Major’s rightwing background. Bundy, he said, “presents orderly protests against the social programs of the National Council of Churches.”

We “contaminators” responded to the Buckley blast with a letter-to-the-editor carried in full by the Washington Star. But when we asked the Star Syndicate for a list of the publications to which it distributed the Buckley column, it declined supplying it unless Buckley gave permission. He demurred.

Obviously one doesn’t score any polemical points if one doesn’t get in print.

Apparently protecting vested wealth’s preferred access to the mass media as well as to the courts falls within Buckley’s definition of conservatism.

True, Buckley doesn’t win ‘em all. The U.S. Supreme Court ruled against him when he tried to get out of paying dues to the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists. But the loss couldn’t have hurt much. The Right-To-Work Committee’s Defense Fund solicited tax-deductible contributions to press the case.

Win or lose, Buckley is going to keep on scoring polemical points against his opposition so long as he retains access to the more powerful public address system.

OOPS! The Socialist Workers Party was incorrectly identified as “The Socialist Labor Party” in the May HF issue.

Its 1976 candidates are Peter Camejo and Willie Mae Reid for president and v.p.
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