Gregory Rose, the author of the article below, was a member of the U.S. Labor Party from 1973 to 1975. While a member, however, he began informing the FBI concerning the activities of the party, and he has subsequently been the party’s avowed foe. The statements in his article have been checked independently wherever possible and have proved to be true; as to the rest, Mr. Rose’s personal experience and knowledge as a member of the party are the chief bases of his article.

You meet them at a Republican club meeting, or a Chamber of Commerce luncheon, or a scientific conference. They are young (mid- to late twenties), well-dressed, well-groomed, well-spoken. They present themselves as being in favor of economic growth. They speak of energy produced by controlled thermonuclear fusion as “an absolute necessity if the human race is to survive the next quarter-century.” They say that they represent the Fusion Energy Foundation and need contributions from conservative businessmen who understand the need to oppose Ralph Nader and the “eco-freaks who threaten the growth of U.S. industry.” They sound good. You give them a check.

What they do not tell you is that the Fusion Energy Foundation (FEF), recently and incredibly granted tax-exempt status, is a front for the National Caucus of Labor Committees (NCLC) and its electoral arm, the United States Labor Party (USLP), a self-styled Marxist organization with intimate ties to groups as disparate as the Soviet Mission to the United Nations, the Palestinian terrorist movement, and Willis Carto’s Liberty Lobby.

They also do not tell you that your contribution will fund NCLC/USLP propaganda, as well as some of the group’s other, equally dubious, undertakings. Nor do they tell you that, not long ago, the NCLC undertook a major campaign to penetrate and influence conservative organizations nationwide.

Emerging originally as a faction of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) during the 1968 Columbia University student strike, the NCLC has grown into an international organization with 1,500 to 2,000 members in the U.S., Canada, Western Europe, and Latin America. Another 1,000 to 1,500 NCLC supporters (called “periphery” by the organization) are grouped around various front organizations, including the U.S. Labor Party (and parallel organizations in other countries—the North American LP, European LP, and Latin American LP), the FEF, the National Unemployed and Welfare Rights Organization (NUWRO), the International Workingmen’s Association (IWMA), the Labor Organizer’s Defense Fund (LODF), the International Press Service (IPS), and the Committee for Fair Elections (CFE). Its newspaper is called *New Solidarity*. The NCLC, along with its fronts, is under the tight control of its chairman, Lyndon H. LaRouche Jr. (also known by his party name, “Lyn Marcus”), a former Trotskyite who has, in his more modest moments, described himself as “the American Lenin.”

Discipline in the organization is strict, and dissenters from LaRouche’s particular brand of orthodoxy are dealt with severely. Several NCLC members were arrested in New York in January 1974 for allegedly kidnapping a dissident member and holding her against her will. (The woman later dropped the charges.) The personal lives of members are extensively regulated by the organization. Ties with family and former friends are discouraged. “Unauthorized” personal relations are forbidden. Activities as varied as marijuana-smoking and masturbation are expulsion offenses. Any activity that does not serve the NCLC’s interest will generally result in the attention of the NCLC’s equivalent of the GPU, the Security Staff.

In recent years the NCLC has distinguished itself from the legitimate Left in the U.S. by its ascriptions of all secular evils to the machinations of the Rockefeller family, its periodic predictions of imminent apocalypse (usually in the form of thermonuclear war), and its perfervid invective. Here is a small sample of the NCLC’s rhetoric, from the editorial pages of its theoretical journal, *The Campaigner* (July 1975):

> The world stands on the threshold of the greatest dangers and the greatest promise it has faced in decades. Rockefeller will use any political loophole to try to clamp down his police terror regime. His vision is 1946: terror bombing of millions in Japan, massive European Communist Parties doomed to impotence, whole populations starved into submission. Again he aims to be lord of the rubble—the rubble of Brazil, Western Europe, and the United States.

Or from the December 1975 issue:

> At this moment, the human race stands closer to destruction than at any time in its history. The remaining loyal elements of
the Rockefeller political-financial machine—which once bestrode
the world like a colossus but now rages in the [sic] mortal terror
of its impending extinction as a species—are determined to sal-
vage what they can by bringing the world to the brink of nuclear
war. Under present military-strategic circumstances, such desperate
folly means the total thermonuclear destruction of North America
and major destruction in Europe and the Soviet Union.

Among the allegations which have sprinkled the pages
of New Solidarity are predictions of imminent worldwide
famine and epidemics, all courtesy of the alleged Rockefeller
cabal." The means by which this impending doom may be
averted have changed with the NCLC’s line over the years; what
has never changed is the necessity that the NCLC
“seize state power within five years.”

Those who publicly dissent from this world-view may find
themselves, at some point, targets of the NCLC. An NCLC
leaflet dated April 4, 1974 attacks various members of the
New York AFL-CIO Central Labor Council as “homosexu-
als,” “perverts,” and “criminals.” These unionists and their
families were subjected to a campaign of obscene and threat-
ening phone calls by NCLC cadres, orchestrated by the
NCLC Security Staff in New York. Another NCLC leaflet
referred to the president of a UAW local in Toledo in terms
the mildest of which was “Woodcocksucker.” He and his
family were also subjected to obscene and harassing phone
calls. The father of an NCLC member, who was attempting
to persuade his daughter to leave the organization, was
welcomed one morning by a hearse whose driver and attendant
had been told “to pick up the body.”

The father of an NCLC member, who was attempting to persuade his daughter to leave the organization, was greeted one morning by a hearse whose driver and attendant had been told ‘to pick up the body’

The NCLC’s line over the years has included both opportunities and dangers. On the one hand, the NCLC has offered to exploit right-wing opposition as a means of undermining the Rockefeller political-financial machine. On the other hand, the NCLC’s tactics have sometimes led toharassment and violence.

The John Birch Society has since strongly repudiated the NCLC
In the June 16, 1975 issue of *New Solidarity*, Jones's call to "his former comrades in the American Party and other right-wing organizations to join with the Labor Party in its drive to impeach Vice President Nelson Rockefeller and to endorse the Labor Party's reconstruction program" was published. It read in part:

I came into the U.S. Labor Party for action. The Right is divided. It has no national program. All I did while a member of the American Party was go from meeting to meeting. There was never discussion of what really had to be done. . . . We must take our foreign and military policy out of the hands of the insane Rockefeller cabal and put it back in the hands of the people and their elected representatives. Rockefeller has already bankrupted the capitalist system. Now, he is bringing us to the brink of nuclear war with the Soviet Union. We must follow the USLP's programmatic lead.

Jones's appeal met with limited success. Mary Kangas, identified in the article as the Oregon state chairwoman of the Women's Federation of the American Party, joined in his call.

Contacts with Roy Frankhouser, an officer of the Pennsylvania Ku Klux Klan and an activist in the Minutemen and the American Nazi Party, were initially fruitful. However, disclosure of Frankhouser's role as an FBI informant temporarily took the NCLC aback. Regrouping, the organization proceeded to give extensive publicity to the Frankhouser case, claiming it as evidence of the alleged "FBI-CIA-Rockefeller-Buckley" control of the extremist Right.

Vastly more useful to the NCLC, in any case, was a series of contacts provided by Ken Duggan. Duggan introduced the NCLC's Scott Thompson to Willis Carto of the Liberty Lobby. Thompson met regularly with Carto through 1975 and 1976. Sources close to the NCLC report that these meetings centered on joint anti-Rockefeller actions and Carto's use of his connections to procure funding for these operations. These sources further report that Carto's Liberty Lobby was a conduit for extremist right-wing contributions to LaRouche's USLP campaign for the Presidency, including part of the more than $90,000 used to purchase a half-hour prime-time commercial on NBC on the eve of the 1976 election. These allegations are under investigation by the Federal Election Commission.

Other NCLC/Liberty Lobby cooperation included Carto's selling of NCLC literature through his radical rightist network, and prominently displayed endorsements of the NCLC program in the Liberty Lobby newspaper, *Spotlight*. Similar entree was provided by Duggan into Carto's National Youth Alliance and C. B. Baker's Youth Action.

Duggan also facilitated an NCLC operation undertaken at the behest of the Iraqi Mission to the United Nations, which asked the NCLC Security Staff in May 1975 to investigate the National Renaissance Party (NRP). Some time earlier the NRP had published an antisemitic and pro-Iraqi tract, and the Iraqis, who could not afford the potential embarrassment of an open contact with the NRP, were interested in the group as a possible conduit for propaganda. After some investigation, the NCLC reported back to the Iraqis that the NRP was too small and unstable to be of any real use.

A corollary interest of the NCLC's in this period was, as suggested above, the Buckley family, *National Review*, and responsible conservative organizations, which were seen by the NCLC as instruments of the Rockefeller-CIA conspiracy. Agreements were made with Carto and Baker to exchange information on the Buckleys, YAF, the ACU, *NR*, and others. The offices of *National Review* and Buckley residences in New York City, Stamford, Conn., and Sharon, Conn. were placed under periodic surveillance by the NCLC Security Staff. NCLC security officers visited Robert Yoakum, a freelance writer in Lakeville, Conn., a few miles from Sharon, who opened his extensive files on the Buckley family to the NCLC. This material was used in a series of *New Solidarity* articles on the Buckleys, but the files were also intended, according to sources around the NCLC, for use in planned clandestine harassment operations against the Buckleys. In addition, NCLC security officers purporting to be journalists and conservative activists placed calls to *NR*, YAF, the ACU, *Human Events*, and others to gain current information on various conservative figures.

LaRouche's decision to run a presidential campaign in 1976 marked a turning point in the NCLC's overtures to the Right. For the first time, a serious campaign would be mounted to penetrate, influence, and finally exploit those conservative circles that had previously been dismissed as
under control of the “FBI-CIA-Rockefeller-Buckley” cabal. In late 1975 and early 1976, the NCLC focused its attentions on the Republican Party and responsible conservative activists. These operations came to be known as “building the Whig Coalition.”

The bizarre twists and turns of the NCLC line during the 1976 presidential campaign are difficult to catalogue. The assassination attempts upon President Ford by Sara Jane Moore and Lynette Fromme were described in New Solidarity as attempts by Vice President Rockefeller and Secretary of State Kissinger to remove Ford and replace him with Rockefeller. Somewhat later, the Reagan candidacy was characterized by New Solidarity as a move by the Rockefeller cabal to dislodge the allegedly anti-Rockefeller Ford forces by a sally from the Right. Finally, the Carter candidacy was heralded by the NCLC as the final blow by the Rockefeller cabal against the “Whig-constitutionalist” Ford. The basis for these theorizations is, to put it charitably, obscure.

However, the increasingly pro-Ford disposition of the NCLC formed the basis for the “Whig Coalition” operations. NCLC field organizers presented Ford, during their campaigning for LaRouche, as the lesser of two evils and the candidate most worthy of support after LaRouche. This line was repeated in a nationally broadcast prime-time paid commercial in which LaRouche spoke for half an hour on the eve of the election. According to informed sources, slightly less than half the $90,000 spent on the commercial came from Republican Party circles; the remainder, according to these same sources, came from right-wing Texas oil interests through Willis Carto and the Liberty Lobby. Precisely why members of the Republican Party should contribute funds to a campaign as bizarre as LaRouche’s is a question which deserves an answer.

It was after the 1976 presidential election that the NCLC openly began trying to work jointly with Republicans and responsible conservative groups. This new “Whig Coalition” operation was centered in the Committee for Fair Elections, an NCLC front organization, which charged the Carter campaign and the Democratic Party with massive vote fraud and challenged Carter’s election in the courts on that basis. CFE-originated suits were filed in New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Wisconsin and listed as complainants in the various litigations. NCLC members, particularly security officers, use IPS credentials to gain admission to various functions as accredited members of the press. An NCLC “Security Memorandum,” dated April 28, 1975, reports:

[...]

These IPS congressional contacts included not merely propaganda and lobbying activities, but also the rifling of files and unauthorized procurement of documents.

Another major thrust of the “Whig Coalition” is the NCLC’s attempt to make conservative contacts through the Fusion Energy Foundation. Founded at the prompting of and under the auspices of the NCLC, the FEF remains firm-

The entrée the NCLC has sought into conservative organizations provides an opportunity for circulating Soviet propaganda in circles where a direct Soviet overture would be impossible
tember 25 Whig Policy Conference] closed with a spirited fund-raising session that demonstrated in dollars the degree of support for the American system. The group raised $2,000. . . .” Once again, the politics of the quick buck.

Three plausible explanations can be given for the web of contacts the NCLC has maintained with the radical Right and sought to build with the responsible Right:

1. The NCLC has a pecuniary interest in cultivating funding sources on the Right. Contributions to the CFE and FEF, for example, help considerably to reduce the NCLC’s operating deficit.

2. The NCLC has an obvious ideological affinity with the extreme Right. Radical rightist organizations such as the Liberty Lobby share the NCLC’s conspiratorial Weltanschauung. The paranoid fascination with the Rockefeller family which characterizes the NLC also characterizes much of the radical Right.

3. The NCLC’s approach to responsible conservative organizations could be part of a campaign to penetrate these groups in the interests of the Soviet Union and its intelligence apparatus. The NCLC is avowedly pro-Soviet, as even a cursory examination of New Solidarity will show. The entree the NCLC has sought into conservative organizations provides an opportunity for circulating Soviet propaganda in circles where a direct Soviet overture would be impossible. This hypothesis is reinforced by the NCLC’s close relationship with the Soviet Mission to the United Nations.

In January 1974 the first NCLC contact with the Soviet Mission was established. After an initial meeting with a Soviet diplomat who identified himself as Nikolai Logunov, Soviet liaison with the NCLC was handled by Gennady Nikolayevich Serebreyakov. While Serebreyakov was officially listed as a press officer of the Mission, he has been identified as a KGB official.

The NCLC representative in this liaison was Konstandinos Kalimtis (a/k/a “Gus Axios”), a former Greek CP member, heavily involved, as he has told me, in Soviet-sponsored underground activities during the reign of the Colonels. Kalimtis met regularly with Serebreyakov through 1974-75. NCLC Chairman LaRouche met with Serebreyakov on at least two occasions, once at the Mission and, later, at the NCLC national headquarters in New York. It is not known who replaced Serebreyakov after his return to the Soviet Union, but informed sources suggest that a more clandestine form of contact has been established. The full range of discussions undertaken in these contacts is unknown. But after 1974, the NCLC’s Trotskyist line was replaced by a pro-Soviet line.

The NCLC is in a position to promote a pro-Soviet line on such issues as U.S. defense posture within certain conservative circles, whereas the Soviets could not make such an approach directly. It is equally obvious that information on conservative attitudes and personalities gained from NCLC contacts would be helpful to Soviet intelligence.

The NCLC’s ability to move in conservative circles rests not merely on the failure of conservatives to perceive the true character of such fronts as the Committee for Fair Elections and the Fusion Energy Foundation, but, more, on a fundamental misunderstanding of the parent organization. The NCLC’s posture of political independence, its advocacy of positions on issues that are tangential to its own primary political program but important to conservative activists (e.g., opposition to the decriminalization of marijuana), and the forcefulness of its criticisms of prominent Left and liberal leaders have led many on the Right to buy its pitch—and pay for it.

Responsible leftists and liberals, the victims of NCLC violence and harassment, have long harbored serious suspicions of the NCLC’s methods and aims. Much of the Left regards the NCLC as a police-provocateur organization. There is little evidence, if any, to support such a hypothesis. However, the evidence of a Soviet connection is extensive and well-founded. Conservatives should regard the NCLC with hostility and should warn and, if necessary, repudiate those on the Right whom it has ensnared.