

U.S. Labor Party sues *The New York Times* for \$100 million

On Oct. 7 and 8, the *New York Times* published a two-part slanderous article on the U.S. Labor Party and its former chairman Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. Authored by veteran *Times* reporter Paul Montgomery on the basis of "investigations" conducted by him and Howard Blum, the *Times* article makes a particular point of suggesting that the Federal Election Commission seriously investigate any application for federal matching funds made on behalf of LaRouche's campaign for the Democratic presidential nomination.

The U.S. Labor Party responded immediately with an Oct. 7 release, reprinted below, announcing that the party would be initiating legal action against the *Times*.

The *Times*, however, would appear to be undeterred by the threat of a \$100 million lawsuit and the possibility of other suits filed by individuals and organizations mentioned in the *Times's* piece. On Oct. 10, the *Times*

featured "The Cult of LaRouche" as its third editorial. Summarizing the earlier series, the editorial concludes: "Fortunately, America's prized permissiveness has its limits. How the U.S. Labor Party trains militarily, deals with the tax laws and treats its members and alumni seem to be subjects for official inquiry. The party needs to be examined not for what it says or believes but for what it does beyond soliciting votes."

In late August, this magazine documented the *Times's* collusion in a project to publish a front-page slander of the U.S. Labor Party and LaRouche which was intended to trigger a Justice Department investigation of the party as "anti-Semitic" and "Nazi."

After first farming out the slanders to a small east side New York paper, *Our Town*, the *Times* then decided to go ahead itself, because of European moves toward a gold-based monetary system.

The U.S. Labor Party announced today that it is moving immediately to sue the *New York Times* for \$100 million. This action has been triggered by the publication of a page-one farrago of lies and gross distortions in the early edition of the Sunday, Oct. 7 *New York Times*. In a related action, the party will file a complaint against the *Times* and the *Times's* accomplices with the Federal Election Commission.

The party's officials also stated that they expect other legal actions to be initiated against the *Times* because of the libelous piece published today. The officials reported they had been in communication with Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., and were informed that the candidate also intended to take appropriate action with the Federal Election Commission and was also considering legal action against the *Times*.

Party legal advisors report that the Fusion Energy Foundation has been given cause for damage-action against the *Times*, and that several businesses named in the libelous item have clear grounds for damage-action, too.

According to earlier statements by the authors of

the libel, Howard Blum and Paul Montgomery, the *Times's* publication of the medley of lies and distortions was prepared under the auspices of an understanding among the *Times*, Representative Elizabeth Holtzmann (D-N.Y.) and officials within the Carter Justice Department. Blum and Montgomery assured Labor Party undercover operatives investigating the matter that the *Times's* publication of this piece would serve as a pretext for massive Justice Department harassment of the U.S. Labor Party and other organizations. These statements are recorded on tape and supported as evidence by photographs and affidavits.

If investigation proves that Holtzmann and Justice Department officials are as guilty as Blum and Montgomery avowed, a case will unfold which is potentially greater than "Watergate." In any case, the new legal action against the *Times* will intersect three other civil cases now in progress.

One of these cases is a \$25 million lawsuit against the Anti-Defamation League. This is a conclusively documented case, proving an efficient conspiracy by top-ranking officials of the Anti-Defamation League to incite violence and other unlawful forms of harassment

against the U.S. Labor Party and the person of Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. Another case involves a major lawsuit against the Roy Cohn-linked *Our Town* publication, plus a complaint against the convicted-felon-directed *Our Town* for "criminal solicitation."

Evidence shows that the *Times* has been wittingly involved in complicity with the ADL and with the Roy Cohn-linked publication. In a third case, to which the *Times* refers repeatedly in its libelous piece, the *Times* relies on the testimony of a former Labor Party member presently being sued as a result of his efforts to illegitimately seize control of corporate assets.

Motive for the libel

It might appear that the *Times's* motive in publishing the libel is to injure the primary campaigns of Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. The *Times* does stress the 27 percent vote for a U.S. Labor Party candidate in a recent election in Seattle, Washington. Just recently, *Times* columnist Tom Wicker joined in warning against the possibility that the New Hampshire primary might generate momentum around the candidacy of some "unknown."

However, the *Times's* commitment to this present libel-centered operation was underway prior to the recent pattern of rising momentum for the LaRouche campaign.

Since the launching of the European Monetary System in July 1978, many leading financial executives in New York City and in Western Europe have identified LaRouche as the "intellectual author" of the new, gold-based monetary system now being brought into being. In fact, LaRouche's influence did add significant elements to the basic structure of the proposals developed by the late Jacques Rueff and others. The recent defeats for the International Monetary Fund and World Bank at both the Nonaligned Heads of State summit in Havana and the recent IMF conference at Belgrade, plus the Dresdner Bank's control of the world monetary-gold market, bring LaRouche's proposals very near to realization.

If the new, gold-based monetary system is brought into being, the financial interests associated with the City of London and the New York City investment-banking community will lose the overreaching political and financial power they have enjoyed since the Versailles Treaty. These interests are represented in the United States by the New York Council on Foreign Relations. The *New York Times* is the popular house-organ in fact for the New York Council on Foreign Relations.

Because of his influence as an economist, LaRouche has been repeatedly described as a "fearful" variety of "potential danger" by high-level spokesmen around both the City of London and the orbit of the New York Council on Foreign Relations. It was for that reason

that the London-CFR crowd deployed both the Anti-Defamation League and the Heritage Foundation to conduct slanders and harassment campaigns against LaRouche and his associates beginning May 1978. The Heritage Foundation operates under the top-down control of two foreign-based intelligence organizations, the London International Institute for Strategic Studies, a British intelligence entity, and the Mont Pelerin Society, a Hapsburg-linked, profeudalist organization created for the purpose of subverting the United States.

LaRouche's growing reputation as the leading economist of the 20th century, and his influence as a presidential candidate, merely intensifies the hatred and fear of the candidate among the circles which control the *New York Times*.

According to earlier disclosures by Blum and Montgomery, the *Times's* original plan had been to start the libel with a page one headline to the effect "Labor Party Linked to CIA." This eye-catching charge would attract interest among credulous readers. Then, the rest of the garbage Blum and Montgomery were piecing together would be attached to the opening paragraphs.

For various reasons, the *Times* abandoned the "CIA-linked" gimmick. All that remains of that earlier version of the libel is the included reference to Roy Frankhouser in the published version. The dropping of the "CIA-linked" gimmick forced the *Times* to adopt a new lead-in stunt. The theme of "cult" and "cult-like" was chosen for this purpose.

Times solicits violence

Otherwise the present version of the story is essentially what Blum and Montgomery outlined, unwittingly, to Labor Party security operatives deployed undercover. The story is designed, as Blum and Montgomery unwittingly put on record, to provide a cover for what would be in fact unlawful harassment by agencies of the Carter administration. The article also represents a clear act of solicitation to violence by the *Times*. Montgomery both seeks to incite violence against Labor Party members, and also indicates that the *Times* and its friends are disposed not only to condone such violence but also to influence courts to the effect of letting the perpetrators of such crimes off free. In fact, the *Times* article includes statements which attempt to mitigate charges of violence against a defendant arrested for assault and battery on a Labor Party woman, in a trial now in preparation.

The hard core of the *Times's* attempt at solicitation to violence is the inclusion of the lying characterization of LaRouche and of the Labor Party as anti-Semitic. As in the case of the Roy Cohn-linked *Our Town* libels, solicitation to violence by convicted felon Ed Kayatt resulted in assaults on Labor Party members.

One can not condone the *Times's* charge of anti-Semitism as a matter of interpretation. The charges of anti-Semitism against the Labor Party have been argued

on two premises. One of these premises is the Labor Party's denunciation of Israeli atrocities in Lebanon and in the occupied territories, together with the Labor Party's proposal of the same policies recently voiced by Nahum Goldmann and other prominent Zionist leaders. The second premise used to give color of truth to the lying charge is the exposure of certain Jewish-name elements of national and international organized crime as accomplices in the Hong Kong-Rangoon-Singapore centered heroin traffic, in complicity with the government of Peking. To call that exposure "anti-Semitism" is the most evil sort of nonsense.

Hitler got his job through the New York Times

An authoritative writer has revealed that Adolf Hitler was a Bavarian correspondent for the *New York Times* during the middle 1920s. There is no disputing the *New York Times* headlines on the Hitler coup d'etat at the time. After the visit to New York City by Hitler patron Hjalmar Schacht, the *Times* was among the most influential newspapers which attempted to play down Hitler's anti-Semitism, and which generally supported the Hitler regime as a necessary expedient.

To the point is the *Times's* rage against the nonpartisan National Anti-Drug Coalition. This should not be surprising. Not only is the *Times* allied politically to the forces pushing marijuana decriminalization and related evils, but the *Times* is closely allied to the financial interests which control the more than \$200 billion international drug traffic. The leading promoters of nonenforcement against the drug traffic outside the Carter administration itself are Senators Jacob Javits and Edward Kennedy. On this point, the motive for the *Times's* lying charge of "anti-Semitism" is all too obvious.

The right-wing label

The gist of the *Times's* argument for the "cult" gimmick is the argument that the Labor Party has undergone a top-down transformation into a "right-wing" "anti-Semitic" organization. The charge of "anti-Semitism" we have identified as a straight lie. The charge of "right-wing" outlooks is silly. Although the Labor Party has developed a new configuration of tactical alliances since January 1974, it is nonsense to argue that the party's outlook or method have changed over the period of its existence. Developed to greater richness, yes; changed in any essential feature, no.

Although the National Caucus of Labor Committees and Labor Party are distinct, separate organizations, it is true that the Caucus's outlook has successfully prevailed in the Labor Party. Therefore, it is useful to examine the Caucus's record over the past decade to present a conclusive case on the matter immediately at hand.

From the inception, the National Caucus of Labor Committees was reflective of LaRouche's deeply-en-

grained commitment to a method and outlook most exactly labeled "Neoplatonic." This was coupled with LaRouche's authority as a leading economic thinker, and colored by LaRouche's expert correction of the fundamental errors in Karl Marx's *Capital*. Furthermore, from the beginning to the present, the Caucus has been committed to high rates of real economic growth as national and global policies, and to the promotion of scientific progress and capital-intensive modes of investment as the indispensable means for achieving such growth.

The tactical posture of the Caucus has always been determined by discovery of the combination of forces in society which agrees or tends to agree with the Caucus's insistence on high-technology economic-growth policies. In the United States, this configuration includes black leaders, some progrowth trade-union figures, some high-technology-oriented farmers, some businessmen, scientists, and so forth. Internationally, this includes Christian Democrats and Gaullists, together with forces typified by President Lopez Portillo of Mexico.

Otherwise, the right-to-left gradation of political philosophy has always been nonsensical. As France's President Giscard d'Estaing rightly emphasized in an address at Bordeaux, the tradition of fitting present-day politics to 1790s seating arrangements in the French revolutionary parliament has always been folly. Unfortunately, although right-versus-left schemas were never better than theatrical fantasies, too many credulous people have not only accepted such fantasies, but have often acted out those delusions. The only fundamental fighting issue over thousands of years to the present day—the only issue really worth fighting—is between the forces of reason, the city-builders, and the opponents of technological progress, the "feudalist" Malthusian-like forces, like today's "antinuclear reactionaries."

In this time of crisis, those forces which stand for reason, for technological progress, tend to come together in common cause against the scourge of "anti-technology" small-is-beautiful barbarism. In coming together the allied forces begin to drop off those "right-wing" and other false labels they carried as ideological baggage in the past. So, to the extent that support for high-technology, capital-intensive economic growth is viewed by the *Times* and sundry lunatics as "right-wing" postures today, the label "right wing" sticks in the eyes of the *Times* and the Fonda-followers generally whenever the Labor Party comes under discussion.

The Labor Party is opposed to the effort to transform the United States into a drug-ridden, clockwork-orange-like gambling den, into a new Sodom and Gomorrah. For that reason, those libertarians who prefer such exotics as marijuana and pederasty in our public schools denounce the Labor Party as "right-wing."