

RIGHT WOOS LEFT

Populist Party, LaRouchian, and Other Neo-fascist Overtures To Progressives, And Why They Must Be Rejected

Chip Berlet

Political Research Associates
October 7, 1992

*Fascism and Reaction inevitably attack.
They have won against disunion.
They will fail if we unite.*

George Seldes
You Can't Do That, 1938

*Political Research Associates
678 Massachusetts Avenue, Suite 205
Cambridge, MA 02139
(617) 661-9313*

Political Research Associates is an independent research institute which collects and disseminates information on right-wing political groups and trends. Centralized in its archives is a continuously updated collection of over one hundred right-wing publications, including newspapers, magazines, newsletters, and direct mail appeals. The institute's library contains hundreds of volumes relating to the political right wing. Also maintained are extensive files of primary and secondary material on individuals, groups, and topics of interest to those researching the right wing.

Political Research Associates offers classes on the American right wing, provides speakers for groups and conferences, publishes educational posters, and prepares, on request, specific research reports on topics pertaining to the political right wing.

The Political Research Associates Monograph Series provides individual authors and researchers an opportunity to explore specific aspects of right-wing activism in depth. Topical Reports provide background information on a subject of current interest to those monitoring the right wing in America.

Copyright 1992, Political Research Associates

Political Research Associates
678 Massachusetts Avenue, Suite 205
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
(617) 661-9313

0 of 2583 9471

SRLF
URL

Table of Contents

Preface & Acknowledgements 1

Introduction 6

Paranoid Conspiracism and the Right 7

 The New Right & The Secular Humanism Conspiracy 10

 John Birch Society 10

 Liberty Lobby 11

 The LaRouchians 13

 The White Supremacist Movement 16

 The Outer Limits of Hate 17

Right-Wing Critics of U.S. Intelligence Agencies and Foreign Policy 17

 Populist Party/Liberty Lobby Recruitment of Anti-CIA Critics 19

 The Liberty Lobby Populist Action Committee 20

 The LaRouchian Critique 21

 The LaRouchians as Anti-Interventionists 22

 Rightist Influences on the Christic Institute Theories 25

 The Right-Wing Roots of Sheehan's "Secret Team" Theory 27

 Barbara Honegger, The October Surprise & The LaRouchians 29

The Gulf War 29

 Sowing Confusion 30

 The LaRouchians and the Gulf War 31

 How The LaRouchians Exploited Antiwar Organizers 34

 How the LaRouchians Exploit Ramsey Clark 35

 Clark Responds 36

 Rev. James Bevel 37

 Other Right-Wing Groups and the Gulf War 39

 Other Gulf War Issues 39

 The Racist Right and the Gulf War 39

 The Buchanan Controversy 41

The Courtship Continues 41

 Craig Hulet's Reductionist Gulf War Critiques 44

 How the Populist Party Uses Hulet 45

 Left/Right Critiques and Coalitions 46

 The JFK Conspiracy 47

 True Gritz 50

 Confusion Reigns as Courage Falters 50

 The Fascist Response 51

 Anti-Jewish Scapegoating & Black Nationalism 52

 Anti-Jewish Conspiracism in the Black Community 53

 Farrakhan and the Nation of Islam 55

Fascists as Information Sources 55

 Progressive Researchers & Fascist Sources 58

 LaRouche: Victim or Villain? 61

 Some Criteria for Discussion 63

Propaganda, Deception & Demagoguery 63

 Flaws of Logic, Fallacies of Debate 64

 Techniques of the Propagandist 64

 Some Examples 65

 Harry Martin and Propaganda Techniques 68

Conclusions 68

 A Painful Task

reliable.⁵ The views of these conspiracy peddlers are frequently promoted on alternative radio programs, and they have created a progressive constituency that confuses demagoguery with leadership, and undocumented conspiracism with serious research. Many of their followers seem unable to determine when an analysis supports or undermines the progressive goals of peace, social justice and economic fairness. This is primarily a problem within the white left, but in some Black nationalist constituencies the same dynamic has also popularized conspiracy theories which in some cases reflect anti-Jewish themes long circulated by the far right.

Conspiracism and demagoguery feature simplistic answers to complex problems. During periods of economic or social crisis, people may seek to alleviate anxiety by embracing simple solutions, often including scapegoating. This often manifests itself in virulent attacks on persons of different races and cultures who are painted as alien conspiratorial forces undermining the coherent national will. Conspiracism, scapegoating, and demagoguery are prime ingredients of fascist ideology. Certainly progressives who supported the meteoric presidential candidacy of H. Ross Perot reflected a myopic misunderstanding of the role demagoguery and anti-regime rhetoric play in building a mass-base for fascism. Perot himself was not a fascist, but the political base he was forging could easily have been shaped into a fascist movement given the necessary economic and political conditions. Historically, demagogues project an image of strength and confidence which some persons in a society facing social and economic upheaval can find attractive.⁶

The phenomenon of the right wooing the left became highly visible during the 1990 military buildup preceding the Gulf War. Followers of Lyndon LaRouche attended antiwar meetings and rallies in some thirty cities, and other right-wing organizers from groups such as the John Birch Society and the

Populist Party passed out flyers at antiwar demonstrations across the country. While these right-wing groups undeniably opposed war with Iraq, they also promoted ideas that peace and social justice activists have historically found objectionable. Many people seeking to forge alliances with the left around anti-government and anti-interventionist policies also promote Eurocentric, anti-pluralist, patriarchal, or homophobic views. Some are profoundly anti-democratic; others support the idea that the U.S. is a Christian republic. A few openly promote white supremacist, anti-Jewish, or neo-Nazi theories.

While there is inevitable overlap at the edges of political movements, the far-right and fascist sectors being discussed in this study are separate and distinct from traditional conservatism, the right wing of the Republican Party, libertarianism, anarchism, and other political movements sometimes characterized as right wing. The John Birch Society, for instance, is a far-right reactionary political movement, but it attempts to distance itself from racist and anti-Jewish theories. Other groups analyzed in this paper, such as the Populist Party, Liberty Lobby, and the LaRouchians, on the other hand, represent a continuation of the racist, anti-democratic theories of fascism.

It is important to differentiate between the fascist right and persons on the left who in a variety of ways have been lured by the overtures of the fascist right and its conspiracist theories, or who have ended up wittingly or unwittingly in coalitions with spokespersons for the fascist right, or who have contact with the fascist right as part of serious and legitimate research into political issues.

In some cases progressive groups have begun to address the problems created by this courtship by the right. Radio station WBAI aired several hours of programming within a week of discovering that their broadcasts had included interviews with persons whose right-wing affiliations were not disclosed to

5 Many of these conspiracy peddlers are promoted in the catalog from the California-based Prevailing Winds, and a spokesperson for Prevailing Winds complained in a letter to *The Progressive* that I had attacked John Judge as right wing. While I have criticized John Judge's lunatic and undocumented conspiracy theories as "sincerely motivated but misguided," and am deeply troubled by Judge's promotion of Fletcher Prouty, I have never called Prevailing Winds nor John Judge right-wing; nor did Toronto's *NOW Magazine* in their accurate and devastating article on Judge that quoted Jane Hunter and me as critics.

6 See generally Arendt, Hannah. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973 (original edition 1951); Chorover, Stephen L. *From Genesis to Genocide*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1980; Hofstadter, Richard. *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life*, New York: Knopf, 1963; Askenasy, Hans. *Are We All Nazis?* Secaucus, N.J.: Lyle Stuart, 1978.

ties of racist and anti-Jewish groups in rural America were saluted as "heroic," according to persons who attended the meeting. One group of rural farm activists from the Midwest left the meeting after complaining that too many of the attendees were obsessed with Jews. (A series of political and financial schisms has ended the direct relationship between Liberty Lobby and the Populist Party, although both groups still share many of the fundamental anti-Jewish and racist theories.) The forces around the Populist Party believe a conspiracy of rich and powerful Jews and their allies control banking, foreign policy, the CIA and the media in the United States. Like Duke, they also believe in America controlled by white Christians of exclusively European heritage.

The pseudo-scholarly Institute for Historical Review is a "revisionist" research center and publishing house that popularizes the calumny that the historical account of the Nazi Holocaust is a Jewish hoax, an idea central to Carto's worldview. According to researcher Russ Bellant, early in his career Willis Carto produced the magazine *Western Destiny*, which grew out of the Nordacist *Northern World* and a vociferously anti-Jewish magazine called *Right*. *Right* recommended support for the American Nazi Party and was edited by E. L. Anderson who was associate editor of *Western Destiny*. Critics and co-workers of Carto claim E. L. Anderson was a pseudonym for Willis Carto.

Liberty Lobby staff and supporters helped stage the 1978 meeting of the World Anti-Communist League, a group that networks fascist movements around the globe. According to the *Washington Post*, Liberty Lobby workers distributed publications including *Spotlight* at the WACL meeting. A few years later, after a change of leadership and some mostly-cosmetic housecleaning to oust a few ardent Nazi groups, WACL came under the leadership of retired General John "Jack" Singlaub. Singlaub used WACL to raise money and support for the Contras, and Singlaub and WACL were implicated in the Iran-Contra hearings for having served as a cover and money laundry for the activities of Oliver North.

While the John Birch Society trumpets jingoistic patriotism laced with conspiracy theories, according to scholar Frank P. Mintz, the Liberty Lobby voices "racist and anti-Semitic beliefs in addition to conspiracism." Mintz explains:

Structurally, the Lobby was a most unusual umbrella organization catering to con-

stituencies spanning the fringes of Neo-Nazism to the John Birch Society and the radical right. It was not truly paramilitary, in the manner of the Ku Klux Klan and Nazis, but was more accurately an intermediary between racist paramilitary factions and the recent right.

Former staffers at both the Liberty Lobby and LaRouche's group claim both outfits have cooperated closely on several projects. In the March 2, 1981 issue of its newspaper *Spotlight*, Liberty Lobby cynically defended the relationship this way:

It is mystifying why so many anti-communists and 'conservatives' oppose the USLP [U.S. Labor Party—LaRouche's original electoral arm, ed.]. No group has done so much to confuse, disorient, and disunify the Left as they have...the USLP should be encouraged, as should all similar breakaway groups from the Left, for this is the only way that the Left can be weakened and broken.

More recently, *Spotlight* has distanced itself and Liberty Lobby from the LaRouchians over the issue of the LaRouchians' questionable and illegal fundraising activities.

The LaRouchians

The LaRouchians believe the world is controlled by a sinister global conspiracy of evil-doers. LaRouche traces this conspiracy back to the Babylonian goddess society, and says the historical battle between good and evil is exemplified in the philosophical division between Platonic order and Aristotelian chaos. The Aristotelian conspirators are diverse: the Queen of England ("a dope pusher"), George Bernard Shaw, Jimmy Carter ("a hundred times worse than Hitler"), Playboy magazine, Milton Friedman, Fidel Castro, Jesuits, Masons and the AFL-CIO. A remarkable number of the sinister conspirators turn out to be Jewish.

The LaRouchians have supported foreign dictatorships such as the Marcos regime in the Philippines and the Noriega regime in Panama. LaRouche has written that history would not judge harshly those who beat homosexuals to death with baseball bats to stop the spread of AIDS.

In the early 1970's, Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. took his followers from the political left and guided them into fascist politics. LaRouche's cadre roamed the streets of New York, Philadelphia, and other

cities with clubs and chains beating up trade union leaders, activists, socialists, and communists. At the time they still proclaimed themselves leftists, but the mainstream left shunned the LaRouchians. Then LaRouche began to adopt some of the economic theories of early national socialism. He thought that to make the revolution, there had to be a strong working class, and a strong working class, he figured, required full-employment. Full employment, he reasoned, would best be accomplished by developing a strong, modernized industrial base in the United States. LaRouche then concluded that development of a strong industrial sector was being hampered by the high interest rates demanded by the main sectors of finance capital in the U.S. and overseas.

LaRouche launched an unsuccessful 1976 Presidential bid when he paid cash for an hour of network television air time to warn the nation of a Soviet/Rockefeller/British plot to destroy the world using Jimmy Carter as a puppet. LaRouche's attack on the centers of finance capital during his presidential campaign drew applause from parts of the American political far right, including those forces that equated finance capital with Jewish banking families.

LaRouche's shift toward a Jewish conspiracy theory of history came shortly after the ultra-right Liberty Lobby began praising a 1976 USLP pamphlet titled "Carter and the International Party of Terrorism." The pamphlet outlined the "Rockefeller-CIA-Carter axis," which was supposedly trying to "deindustrialize" the U.S. and provoke a war with the Soviet Union by 1978. (At this point LaRouche had not yet discarded his support for the Soviet Union, nor announced his support for "Star Wars" defense against his perceived threat of imminent Soviet attack.)

In an overall favorable review of the USLP treatise on the Rockefeller-led global conspiracy, Liberty Lobby's newspaper, *Spotlight*, complained that the report failed to mention any of the "major Zionist groups such as the notorious Anti-Defamation League" in its extensive list of government agencies, research groups, organizations and individuals controlled by the "Rockefeller-Carter-CIA" terrorism apparatus. LaRouche never was one to miss a cue, and soon his newspaper *New Solidarity* was running articles with bigoted views of Jews and Jewish institutions. The shift regarding who controlled the worldwide conspiracy came at an opportune

time, since Nelson Rockefeller's untimely death had left a major hole in LaRouche's theoretical bulwark.

While often hidden or coded, sometimes the anti-Jewish rhetoric of the LaRouchians stands out clearly. In the December 12, 1990 issue of *New Solidarity*, a letter to the editor asks why the newspaper "scarcely mention[s] the Warburg and Rothschild families, the most important International Bankers. Is it because they are of Jewish ancestry?" Editor Nancy Spannaus responds:

We do attack the Warburgs and the Rothschilds for the evil they do and did. But they are not the highest level of the international financial oligarchy. That requires looking at the Thurn und Taxis family, the British Royal Family, and so forth. These guys love to use the so-called Jews as their front men.

According to LaRouche, one and a half million Jews, not many millions, perished during the Holocaust, and they died from overwork, disease, and starvation in work camps rather than from a planned program of extermination. This denial of the Holocaust is coupled with pronouncements in LaRouchian publications such as these:

The first, and most important fact to be recognized concerning the Hitler regime, is that Adolph Hitler was put into power in Germany on orders from London. The documentation of this matter is abundant and conclusive. (1978)

America must be cleansed for its righteous war by the immediate elimination of the Nazi Jewish Lobby and other British agents from the councils of government, industry and labor. (1978)

We shall end the rule of irrationalist episodic majorities, of British liberal notions of 'democracy.' (c. 1980)

Zionism is the state of collective psychosis through which London manipulates most of international Jewry. (1978)

Judaism is the religion of a caste of subjects of Christianity, entirely molded by ingenious rabbis to fit into the ideological and secular life of Christianity. In short, a self-sustaining Judaism never existed and never could exist. As for Jewish culture otherwise, it is merely the residue left to the Jewish home after everything saleable has been marketed to the Goyim. (1973)

Sexism and homophobia are central themes of the organization's conspiracy theories. LaRouche announced that women's feelings of degradation in modern society could be traced to the physical placement of sexual organs near the anus which caused them to confuse sex with excretion. A September 1973 editorial in the NCLC ideological journal *Campaigner* charged that "Concretely, all across the U.S.A., there are workers who are prepared to fight. They are held back, most immediately, by pressure from their wives...."

LaRouche has propounded ideas which represent outright racism. LaRouche, for instance, targeted the Hispanic community in a November 1973 essay (published in both English and Spanish) titled "The Male Impotence of the Puerto-Rican Socialist Party." An internal memo by LaRouche asked "Can we imagine anything more viciously sadistic than the Black Ghetto mother?" He described the majority of the Chinese people as "approximating the lower animal species" by manifesting a "paranoid personality....a parallel general form of fundamental distinction from actual human personalities."

The White Supremacist Movement

The most significant branch of the radical white supremacist movement in the 1980's and 1990's is Christian Identity. "Identity is based on the premise that the Jews are literally Children of Satan -the seed of Cain, that people of color are 'pre-Adamic' mud people -God's failures before perfecting Adam, and that white Christian Aryans are the 'Lost Sheep of the House of Israel' -God's chosen people, and therefore America is the biblical promised land," explains Lenny Zeskind, research director of the Center for Democratic Renewal.

"Some Identity members collect weapons and ammunition in expectation that the Biblical 'End-Times' are near," says Zeskind who wrote a monograph on Christian Identity for the Division of Church and Society of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. "Identity theology binds together a number of previously isolated groups...Important sections of the Ku Klux Klan, the neo-Nazi movement, the Posse Comitatus, the Aryan Nations, and other groups have adopted Identity theology," Zeskind reports.

Identity is based primarily on an earlier religious concept called "British Israelism." The group

most responsible for spreading Christian Identity in the 1980's was the Posse Comitatus, a loosely-knit survivalist movement which grew out of the Christian Identity teachings of Col. William Potter Gale in California. Survivalists believe the collapse of society is imminent, and thus they collect weapons and conduct field exercises in armed self-defense and reconnaissance. Some survivalists store large quantities of grains, dried foods, canned goods, water and vitamins in anticipation of long-projected economic or political collapse and racial rioting. Many have moved to isolated rural areas. Not all survivalists are part of the white supremacist movement, but many are.

The Posse Comitatus, Latin for "power of the county" but more accurately transliterated as "to empower the citizenry," is the legal concept used by sheriffs in Hollywood westerns to round up a posse and chase the varmints. In modern legal terms it means the right to deputize citizens to carry out law enforcement functions, and it also is the basis of a federal law preventing the use of federal troops in civilian law enforcement without the express consent of the President. Members of the Posse Comitatus, however, promote an unsubstantiated belief that the Constitution does not authorize any law enforcement powers above the level of county sheriff, and that state and federal officials above the county level are part of a gigantic conspiracy to deny average citizens their rights.

Many Posse and Identity adherents believe Jews, Blacks, Communists, homosexuals and race-traitors have seized control of the United States. They refer to Washington, D.C. as the Zionist Occupational Government (ZOG). They read the novel "The Turner Diaries" in which an underground white army leads a revolution against ZOG.

In 1969 H. L. "Mike" Beach in Portland, Oregon began issuing "Sheriff's Posse Comitatus" charters and handbooks. Soon Gale began issuing his own charters and a handbook called the "Guide for Volunteer Christian Posses." Early factionalism gave way to an informal political and religious movement which began to grow. In the early 1970's a Posse manifesto was issued in booklet form. In late 1974 a national Posse convention was held in Wisconsin with 200 -300 attending.

The most visible and active branch of the Posse for many years was in Wisconsin. The press gave much attention to Wisconsin Posse leader James Wickstrom, although his claims to hold some vague

- Lawrence Patterson, publisher of the far-right ultra-conspiratorial *Criminal Politics* newsletter;
- Jerry Pope, chair of the Kentucky Populist Party;
- John Rakus, president of the National Justice Foundation;
- Hon. John R. Rarick, former Democratic House member now in Louisiana;
- Sherman Skolnick, a Chicagoan who has peddled bizarre conspiracy theories for over a decade;
- Major James H. Townsend, editor of the *National Educator* from California;
- Jim Tucker, *Spotlight* contributor who specializes on covering the Bilderberger banking group;
- Tom Valentine, Midwest bureau chief for *Spotlight* and host of Liberty Lobby's Radio Free America;
- Raymond Walk, an Illinois critic of free trade;
- Robert H. Weems, founding national chairman of the Populist Party.

Prouty has been appearing at conferences and on radio programs sponsored by the Liberty Lobby, but claims "there was never a handshake" concerning his official appointment to the Populist Action Committee.¹⁸ Prouty nonetheless admits that he is aware his name is being publicized in that capacity and refuses to ask his name be dropped from the list.

Skolnick also says he was never "officially" asked to be on the advisory board, but although he is aware he was named to the panel, he refuses to distance himself from the board or Liberty Lobby.¹⁹

The LaRouchian Critique

While Carto's Liberty Lobby network was recruiting Fletcher Prouty, Bo Gritz, longtime CIA

¹⁸ Telephone interview with Prouty.

¹⁹ Telephone interview with Skolnick.

²⁰ The idea of a conspiracy of "Jewish international finance" was a pet theme of Hitler, and can be studied in Hitler's *Mein Kampf* simply by scanning the index of any edition. Arendt discusses the myth of the conspiratorial role of the Rothschild family as central to fascist theory in her work *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, again there are numerous index entries.

critic Victor Marchetti, and assassination conspirators researchers Mark Lane and Dick Gregory, the LaRouchians were probing government misconduct and linking U.S. political elites to their global conspiracy theory.

In the LaRouchian worldview, the oligarchic families of Great Britain are the font of all world evil. Over the years LaRouchian literature has maintained that political leadership in Great Britain is really controlled by Jewish banking families such as the Rothschilds, a standard anti-Jewish theory that influenced such bigots as Henry Ford and Adolph Hitler.²⁰

In their book *Dope, Inc.: Britain's Opium War against the U.S.*, first published in 1978, the LaRouchians assert that the oligarchy in Great Britain is in league with Jewish bankers to control the smuggling of drugs into the United States. Arch-rightist and former U.S. intelligence operative, the late Mitchell WerBell said the book was of "outstanding importance," because it told "the history of a political strike against the United States in an undeclared war being waged by Great Britain."

LaRouche's periodicals mix anti-Israel views with anti-Jewish conspiracy theories, but were among the first periodicals to run articles exposing aspects of the arms-for-hostages deals and the covert Contra aid network, well before a fateful plane crash first tipped off the mainstream press to the full extent of the story.

Many reporters in the mid 1980's were contacted by LaRouchians who offered assistance and documents to help research the Iran-Contra story. This assistance was accompanied by their relentless peddling of typical LaRouchian distortions regarding vast conspiracies, yet many of the individual documents and sources provided by the LaRouchians checked out as factual. Some reporters decided it was proper to glean what facts they could from the LaRouche material, assuming they could successfully exclude the lunatic analysis. This process is neither new nor remarkable, reporters deal with questionable sources constantly. Furthermore,

right-wing coverage of government intelligence abuse is not unique to the LaRouchians. Other far-right groups such as Liberty Lobby and its *Spotlight* newspaper have also circulated similar information. In fact, persons formerly affiliated with the Liberty Lobby and the LaRouchians independently confirm that there was a back-door information exchange between the research staffs of both groups in the late 1970's and early 1980's.

The LaRouchians, as well as Liberty Lobby, were among the beneficiaries of the information flow from right-wing anti-CIA circles during the early 1980's. Herb Quinde, an intelligence policy analyst for the LaRouchians, says that in the 1980's the LaRouchians were contacted by a group of disaffected former and current intelligence specialists who Quinde referred to as "the Arabists." Both government and private sector analysts confirm that there are persons critical of current U.S. foreign policy reliance on Israel whose ideas are discussed in policy meetings. These persons are sometimes referred to as "Arabists." They represent a minority viewpoint in government circles that needs to be factored into political equations. Most of these persons are geo-political pragmatists who think that oil is the key to the Middle East and so support for Israel is misguided since Israel doesn't have oil. Others simply support a more even-handed policy in the Middle East, especially concerning Palestinian rights. The so-called "Arabists" are more accurately seen as a diffuse and broad theoretical tendency rather than an ethnic group, pro-Arab faction, or specific political organization.

Some of these persons, however, have fierce anti-Jewish views and have sought alliances with overt bigots and persons who circulate paranoid conspiracy theories in which Jews are believed to control the world. Their theory at its most paranoid believes Great Britain's intelligence services have influenced U.S. intelligence agencies since the inception of the Office of Strategic Services, precursor to the CIA. Great Britain's intelligence empire is seen as predominantly Jewish, riddled with communists and homosexuals, and with an open line to Moscow. Mossad is believed to manipulate U.S. foreign policy and direct much of U.S. intelligence activity. The CIA is believed to be full of moles, probably inserted by a Anglophile/Jewish/Communist network. True patriots are urged to try to expose this "dual loyalist" reality and push the U.S. to ally

with its real friends in the Middle East, the Arab monarchies and familial oligarchies.

These theories have little to do with democracy, social justice or peace in the Middle East, and they use legitimate criticisms of Israeli policies and U.S. pro-Israel policies as a screen to cover prejudice against Jews.

Many reporters were contacted by the LaRouchians offering assistance and documents to help research the Iran-Contra story. LaRouche's *Executive Intelligence Review* even gets a passing nod from author Ben Bradlee, Jr. in his *Guts and Glory: The Rise and Fall of Oliver North*. Bradlee acknowledges the help of *EIR* in decoding the shorthand used by North in his notebooks.

Peter Dale Scott, Jonathan Marshall and other authors who researched the Iran-Contra story say that in the mid to late 1980's, LaRouchians such as Herb Quinde, who had researched the Oliver North network, were involved in the traditional game of the Capitol press corps—circulating documents and trading theories.

The LaRouchians as Anti-Interventionists

During the late 1980's the LaRouchians covertly sought to expand their contacts with the left and attempted to link up with progressive groups over issues such as anti-interventionism, covert action, government domestic repression, civil liberties and Third World debt. Many progressive researchers report that during this period they began to receive telephone calls from LaRouchian operatives suggesting joint work or offering documents or story ideas.

Progressive activists also were targeted. For instance, LaRouche organizers involved themselves in an international anti-interventionist conference held in Panama, and have worked behind the scenes around the issue of U.S. involvement in Panamanian affairs ever since. Although conference organizers say they tried to isolate the LaRouchians at the conference, there is little doubt that the LaRouchians managed to leave the impression with some activists that they were a key component in the alliance against U.S. intervention in Panama.

Former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark has become a vocal opponent of U.S. intervention and was a major critic of the U.S. invasion of Pan-

ama. Clark has regularly worked in the same anti-intervention projects as the LaRouchians, where their presence would have been difficult not to notice. While there is no evidence (or even a reasonable suspicion) that Clark willingly works with the LaRouchians or shares any of their bigoted views, it is clear the LaRouchians delight in implying that just such a relationship exists between themselves and Clark, especially since Clark agreed to represent the LaRouchians in filing legal appeals flowing out of a series of federal criminal convictions of LaRouchian fundraisers and LaRouche himself.

The ability of the LaRouchians to inject themselves into mainstream debate around the issue of Panama is astonishing. For instance, at the April, 1991 conference of the Latin American Studies Association in Washington, D.C., a panel on Panama included LaRouchian expert Carlos Wesley. Wesley was not the first choice. Two panelists from Panama who were originally scheduled to appear did not receive funding to attend the conference, so panel co-coordinator Donald Bray from California State University in Los Angeles then called a person he respected as an expert on Panama for advice on a last minute replacement. "I called Carlos Russell, a Panamanian who now teaches in the U.S., and who was a former Ambassador to the OAS for a former Panamanian government," explains Bray. "He said 'you are not going to believe this, but I am going to recommend a LaRouchite, Carlos Wesley.'" A slightly bemused Bray says he knew Wesley from long ago and knew he was a reporter for LaRouche's *Executive Intelligence Review*. Still, this was a recommendation from a credible Panamanian source so with some misgivings Bray scheduled Wesley as a panelist.

Wesley was identified as a correspondent for *Executive Intelligence Review* (EIR) but, according to author Holly Sklar, who attended the session, many in the audience were not aware that EIR was a LaRouche publication. "Of course if we had identified him as a LaRouchian, nobody would have paid any attention to what he said," explained Bray.

The ties between LaRouche and Panama go back several years to when LaRouche intelligence collectors began trading tidbits of information with Panamanian leader Manuel Noriega. Following Noriega's indictment for conspiracy in drug deals, journalist William Branigin, writing in the *Washington Post* of June 18, 1988, noted that among Noriega's few supporters in the United States was

"political extremist Lyndon H. LaRouche Jr., who has praised the general as a leader in the war on drugs."

According to a January, 1990 *Associated Press* report, LaRouche sent Noriega a cable after his indictment, telling the dictator "I extend to you my apologies for what the government of the United States is doing to the Republic of Panama." LaRouche told Noriega "I reiterate to you what I have stated publicly. That the Reagan administration current policies towards Panama are absolutely an offense to your nation and all of Latin America." This type of rhetoric shows how the LaRouchians can adopt a critique of U.S. foreign policy ostensibly similar to that of the left, while weaving in an *apologia* converting a drug-running dictator into a drug-fighting humanitarian. LaRouche also has high praise for other dictators, including the late Ferdinand Marcos. The LaRouchians claim Marcos actually won his last election.

Another example of ideological cross-fertilization involves Cecilio Simon, a Panamanian who is an administrator at the University of Panama. Simon spoke along with Ramsey Clark and others at the April 6, 1990 "Voices from Panama" forum held at New York City's Town Hall auditorium. Simon later spoke at the LaRouchian "Fifth International Martin Luther King Tribunal of the Schiller Institute," on June 2, 1990 in Silver Spring, Maryland. These incidents demonstrate how the LaRouchians continue to insert themselves into anti-interventionist work and gain credibility on the left.

Rightist Influences on the Christic Institute Theories

The problem of conflating documentable facts with analysis and conclusions and then merging them with unsubstantiated conspiracy theories popular on the far right has plagued progressive foreign policy critiques for several years. The Christic Institute's "Secret Team" theory is perhaps the most widespread example of the phenomenon. While many of the charges raised by Christic regarding the La Penca bombing and the private pro-Contra network are documented, some of their assertions regarding the nature and operations of a long-stand-

ing conspiracy of high-level CIA, military, and foreign policy advisors inside the executive branch remain undocumented, and in a few instances, are factually inaccurate.

There are two related questions in this matter. One is whether or not the case was handled properly with regard to the actual clients, Martha Honey and Tony Avirgan. The other is how much unsubstantiated conspiracism was made part of the case and its surrounding publicity. This paper will focus on the issue of the undocumented conspiracy theories.

Some critics of the Christic Institute say undocumented conspiracy theories, perhaps first circulated by the LaRouchians and the *Spotlight*, were inadvertently drawn into Christic's lawsuit against key figures in the Iran-Contra Scandal. The Christic Institute no longer uses the "Secret Team" slogan, which it employed for the first few years of its Iran-Contra lawsuit, *Avirgan v. Hull*. The suit, filed in 1986, is also called the La Penca case, after the Nicaraguan town where a 1984 bombing killed three journalists and at least one Contra and wounded dozens, including television camera operator Avirgan and the intended target, Contra leader Eden Pastora.

It is arguable that while Christic pursued the broad conspiracy of the "Secret Team", the backbone portions of the case involving the actual La Penca incidents took a back seat. A few weeks before the case was slated for trial, the Christic Institute still had not diagrammed the elements of proof, a legal procedure where the text of the complaint is broken down into a list of single elements that have to be proven with either valid documentation, a sworn affidavit, or a live witness. This had created problems for researchers and lawyers who had no master list of what needed to be proven when devising questions for depositions and witnesses.

When a special meeting was convened shortly before trial, it turned out that for some of allegations concerning the alleged broad "Secret Team" conspiracy, the only evidence in possession of the Christic Institute was newspaper clippings and excerpts from books—and in a few instances there was no evidence other than uncorroborated assertions collected by researchers.

Raised at the meeting was the issue of whether or not the case had unwittingly incorporated unsubstantiated conspiracy theories from right-wing groups such as the LaRouchians. The staff was warned that some defendants would likely prevail at trial due to lack of court-quality evidence and would then likely pursue financial penalties (called Rule 11 sanctions).²¹

These matters are important because Christic press statements have fueled the idea, and many Christic Institute supporters believe, that the dismissal of the case was just another example of a massive government conspiracy and cover-up. It is undeniable that the presiding judge was hostile to Christic and stretched judicial discretion to the breaking point in dismissing the case. The dismissal was unfair. However, according to a statement issued by Christic client Tony Avirgan, the Institute must share at least "partial responsibility for the dismissal of the La Penca law suit."

It's sad that these issues have to be raised by 'outsiders' such as Berlet. But the truth is that criticism-self criticism, an essential tool in any social movement, has never been tolerated by the leaders of the Christic Institute. Those who criticized the legal work of Sheehan were labeled as enemies and ignored.

There were, indeed, numerous undocumented allegations in the suit, particularly

²¹ The author attended the meeting and has corroborated these assertions with other persons attending the meeting. The author also is aware that ethical problems are created by reporting even in broad summary the contents of a meeting of a legal team working on a lawsuit. This decision was made only after much thought, discussion, and a failed attempt to carry out private discussions to resolve some of these matters. These matters were first raised by the author internally to Christic staff and leadership in the summer of 1988. Other attempts were made by the author and other persons to have these criticisms dealt with between 1988 and 1990. A final private discussion in the summer of 1991 originally involved the author, Christic client Tony Avirgan, and Christic leadership. It was the Christic Institute's unilateral decision to discontinue that attempt to resolve as many issues as possible privately before the criticisms were made public. The issue is also timely because if Christic refuses to deal with criticism of some of its work in the case, and succeeds in placing the issue of the dismissal before the Supreme Court, the almost-inevitable refusal to reverse the trial judge's decision would take a bad ruling and certify it as the law of the land.

litical enemies" required him to declare a State of National Emergency.

While the descriptions of Cable Splicer and Garden Plot are accurate, the source is deceptively obscured. The original story of Cable Splicer and Garden Plot broke in the alternative press in 1975 in an article by Ron Ridenhour with Arthur Lublow published in Arizona's *New Times*. Garden Plot was also the cover story for the Winter 1976 issue of *CounterSpy* magazine. Dozens of pages of the unedited official documents from Garden Plot and Cable Splicer were reprinted in the magazine. Copies of the official documents were made available to trial teams in several cities litigating against illegal government intelligence abuse.

Several former Christic staffers, who asked to remain nameless, suggest that, at the very least, a critical reevaluation of some allegations made in the Christic case would be beneficial in light of the possibility that material from far-right, conspiracist or anti-Jewish sources was uncritically woven into the original "Secret Team" Christic thesis. They say that the Christic theories need to be reassessed with the ulterior motives and credibility of those sources in mind.

The Christic Institute was supplied with the text of the criticisms raised in this section of the report, as well as an extensive list of written questions. With the exception of the quote regarding the LaRouchians, they chose not to respond.

Barbara Honegger, The October Surprise & The LaRouchians

In many ways the LaRouche organization, with its slickly repackaged conspiracy theories, serves as a nexus for a number of tendencies on the political right, ranging from ultra-conservatives to outright fascists and white supremacists. LaRouchian material on AIDS, for instance, is cited by homophobic organizations such as the fundamentalist Christian group Summit Ministries. It seems clear that the LaRouche network reaches out to many constituencies, including some that seem improbable on the surface, including some on the left.

Over the past few years the LaRouchians have solicited contacts with a number of critics of U.S.

foreign policy and intelligence agency practices, sometimes with surprising success. In many cases, it is the LaRouchian intelligence network that serves as a broker for information flowing between left-wing and right-wing groups. LaRouchians appear to have first penetrated the left in recent years when they began to trade information on covert action and CIA misconduct. The LaRouchians were early critics of the Oliver North network. In the early 1980's, LaRouche intelligence operatives such as Jeffrey Steinberg maintained close ties to a faction in the National Security Council which opposed Oliver North's activities. At the same time the LaRouchians quietly began providing information to mainstream and progressive reporters and researchers.

The Christic Institute and the Empowerment Project which distributes the film "CoverUp: Behind the Iran-Contra Affair" are major promoters of Barbara Honegger's theories regarding an alleged "October Surprise." The October Surprise was the term used among Reagan campaign aides to describe the possibility that the Iranian government might arrange for the release of U.S. hostages prior to the election which pitted incumbent Jimmy Carter against challenger Ronald Reagan. Honegger, a former White House aide, alleges in her book *October Surprise* that officials connected to the Reagan Presidential campaign plotted with Iranian officials to delay the release of hostages in the Middle East until after the election. Substantial circumstantial evidence exists to suggest such a charge might be true, but there is little incontrovertible proof.

Honegger's research and analysis are questionable. In the 1989 edition of her book *October Surprise*, Honegger cites frequently to LaRouchian publications. While some LaRouchian material is factual, other material presented as fact is unsubstantiated rumor or lunatic conspiracy theories. Some anti-fascist researchers also assume that information in EIR occasionally represents calculated leaks by current and former government intelligence agents and right-wing activists to achieve a desired political goal. This practice is a common tactic in power struggles and faction fights over policy.

While Honegger sometimes cites to progressive periodicals such as *In These Times* and *The Nation*, more than six percent (49 out of a total 771) of the footnotes in Honegger's book cite LaRouchian publications such as *EIR*, *New Solidarity*, and *New Federalist*. In one chapter on "Project Diplomacy,"

Honegger LaRouchian cites account for over 22 percent of the total number of footnotes.

Honegger also makes assertions that strain credibility. She quotes without comment the claim of Eugene Wheaton that the CIA is actually secretly controlled by a group of retired members of the OSS.

In the July/August 1991 issue of *The Humanist*, both David MacMichael and Barbara Trent of the Empowerment project defend Honegger and suggest PBS refused to show "Coverup" because it contained serious charges against the U.S. government. As Trent put it:

It was no big surprise that there was a problem getting 'Coverup' on PBS. Programs that address U.S. foreign policy in particular and are not in agreement with the policies of the sitting president rarely get much of a chance on TV.

In fact, PBS has aired on the "Frontline" series programs about the October Surprise and CIA involvement in drug trafficking. PBS has also aired two Bill Moyers specials on Iran-Contragate that

concluded that Reagan lied repeatedly and may have committed impeachable offenses, and that evidence exists to suggest that Bush's role in the Contra resupply operation was far more direct than he has admitted. The primary difference between the shows broadcast by PBS and "Coverup" is the reliance in "Coverup" on Barbara Honegger and Danny Sheehan and their unsubstantiated and undocumented charges. It would have been difficult for PBS to justify running Honegger's assertions given her reliance on material supplied by neo-Nazis with a history of circulating unreliable information.

"Coverup" also promotes the Christic theme that Iran-Contragate was caused by a long-standing conspiracy of individual agents. In contrast to this individualistic formulation, the Moyers programs stress a systemic failure: that the lack of congressional oversight over foreign policy and covert action has created a Constitutional crisis where the balance of powers between branches of government has been skewed toward the executive branch.

One danger posed by the right wing's recruitment attempts is that the widespread conspiracism in some sectors of the far right has found fertile ground among naive or uncritical forces on the left. The problem is exacerbated when rightists put forward their paranoid and sometimes anti-Jewish theories in progressive circles where conspiracist or prejudiced sentiments have been tolerated rather than routinely confronted. Within the U.S. progressive movement, the issue of an undercurrent of anti-Jewish bigotry among some pro-Palestinian, Black nationalist, and left groups has been under discussion for several years.

What the left faces is the task of carefully drawing distinctions between views that are solely anti-Zionist or critical of the state of Israel's policies, and views that reflect bigoted conspiracy theories about persons of Jewish heritage. If peace and social justice forces do not publicly reject anti-Jewish bigots, this task becomes impossible, and the charge of anti-Semitism will taint the entire progressive movement.

The utilization of scapegoating conspiracies is by no means limited to the fascist right, but during the Gulf War some antiwar activists became attracted to scurrilous conspiratorial theories of elite control circulated by right-wing researchers. One conspiracy theorist who gained high visibility during the Gulf War was Craig Hulet. Another conspiracy theorist, Antony Sutton, avoids explicit anti-Jewish rhetoric, but pursues a line promoting arcane banking conspiracies (often involving Jewish banking families traditionally scapegoated by bigots). Sutton also has supported racial separatism between Blacks and whites in South Africa. Another theorist, Eustace Mullins, is a notorious anti-Jewish bigot who focuses on anti-Jewish conspiracy theories in which the Rothschilds and other Jews control the world economy. Mullins' work is promoted by U.S. white supremacist and neo-Nazi circles. Persons supporting the neo-fascist Populist Party used Hulet's radio appearances on progressive Pacifica network radio station KPFA in San Francisco to organize study groups where the theories of Mullins and Sutton were promoted.

The LaRouchians and the Gulf War

The most disruptive rightist penetration of antiwar groups was by the LaRouchians. The LaRouchians generally operate under front groups such as Food for Peace, Schiller Institute, and *Executive Intelligence Review*. Some local antiwar groups have worked with the LaRouchians, while others have not. While often described merely as conservative or extremist, the LaRouche organization and its various front groups are a fascist political movement with echoes of neo-Nazi ideology. The group's ultimate leader, Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., is currently in jail because his fundraisers sold unsecured securities to the elderly and because LaRouche paid no taxes while living in a Virginia mansion. LaRouche was sentenced in January, 1989 to fifteen years in prison after a federal court found LaRouche and six codefendants guilty of a mail fraud conspiracy related to fundraising. LaRouche was also convicted of tax evasion. On appeal, the U.S. Supreme Court let the convictions stand without comment.

LaRouche's lawyers have repeatedly sued activist critics who describe him as a fascist, racist, sexist, homophobic, anti-Jewish bigot, lunatic cult leader, neo-Nazi racial theorist, crook, and demagogue. LaRouche has lost every case. One jury in Virginia found that calling LaRouche a "small-time Hitler" was not defamatory and then awarded damages to the news organization sued by LaRouche.

During the Gulf War the LaRouchians appeared at antiwar rallies and meetings in thirty cities, including New York, Boston, Washington, D.C., Richmond, Chicago, Milwaukee, Detroit, Cleveland, Ann Arbor, St. Louis, Omaha, Seattle, San Francisco, and Los Angeles.

At the University of Ottawa in Canada, LaRouche's Schiller Institute co-sponsored an antiwar event with an organization of Middle Eastern students. At an October 20, 1990 antiwar demonstration in New York City, the Schiller Institute had four people carrying a large banner and a small group of supporters organized in a contingent. The LaRouchians have passed out petitions at antiwar rallies, and then called the persons who signed the petitions to solicit money for the LaRouche organi-

zation. Other fundraising pitches are made at anti-war rallies.

In a flyer announcing a December 15, 1990 rally, a group called simply the "LaRouche Organization" was originally listed as a coalition member. The presence of the LaRouchians, as well as other anti-Jewish bigots, in the St. Louis antiwar coalition originally caused consternation, especially among members of New Jewish Agenda, a group which supports a democratic Israel, Palestinian rights, and a Palestinian homeland. When coalition leaders were provided with documentation of LaRouchian attacks on Jews, Blacks and other minorities, including LaRouchian support for the apartheid government of South Africa, the LaRouche supporters were booted out of the coalition.

In Los Angeles, several LaRouchians were dismayed when the local antiwar coalition pointed to its principles of unity, which included a call for a sensible non-nuclear energy policy. The LaRouchians are vocal supporters of nuclear power. In Richmond, Virginia, local antiwar organizers simply kept shouting at the LaRouchians to "shut up" when they began their bizarre spiels and for a time the LaRouchians stopped coming to meetings. The LaRouchians soon returned, but attempted to keep a low profile while persistently circulating their literature.

During December, LaRouche's followers held vigils on a number of campuses to build support for a touted "National Teach-In to Stop the War" held December 15-16 in Chicago. The Chicago conference, titled "Development is the New Name for Peace," turned out to be the annual LaRouche-sponsored Food for Peace Conference, repackaged to attract antiwar activists. The conference drew over 350 attendees. Several persons active with the St. Louis African-American Anti-War/Peace Coalition who attended the conference were later asked to leave the Coalition for being disruptive and spreading anti-Jewish conspiracy theories, according to several St. Louis activists who spoke on condition of anonymity.

Only three dozen students were sprinkled among the crowd which drew persons from California, Oregon, North and South Dakota, Maryland, New Jersey, Virginia, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Nebraska, and the Canadian province of Quebec. Many in the audience were farmers. Close to one-third of the conference attendees were African-Americans.

While the number of students was small, the emphasis on the situation in the Middle East was not neglected. LaRouche regulars Mel Klenetsky and Nancy Spannaus moderated the program which included a videotaped message and live phone patch from the cultural attache for the Iraqi embassy, Dr. Mayser Al Mallah. The LaRouche organization has maintained ties with the Iraqi Ba'ath Party for many years, according to several former LaRouchian intelligence gatherers who have left the group.

Other panelists at the LaRouchian conference included the Rev. James Bevel, an early civil rights leader now active in several LaRouchian front groups; a representative from Minister Louis Farrakhan's Nation of Islam, Dr. Abdul Alim Muhammad, editor of the *Final Call*; and Gene Wheaton, a private investigator who works with both left-wing and right-wing critics of U.S. clandestine operations.

How The LaRouchians Exploited Antiwar Organizers

A long-time political activist who marched with the Cleveland contingent in the January 19th antiwar demonstration in Washington, D.C. was more than a little surprised when he noticed that people in the contingent next to him were passing out literature from Lyndon LaRouche's political front groups. "They were beating a drum and chanting 'George Bush, You Can't Hide, the New World Order is Genocide,'" he reports. "There were about 100 people, many elderly, some Black," he says, and one flyer they handed out carried a headline scolding, "U.S. Citizens Must Recognize Their Past Mistakes and Support LaRouche." There was a large banner and some people carried signs that said "Free LaRouche, Jail the ADL." At the march the LaRouchians passed out their *New Federalist* newspaper. "A lot of people who remember *New Solidarity* don't realize its new name is *New Federalist*," said the Cleveland activist.

According to Gavrielle Gemma, coordinator of the National Coalition to Stop U.S. Intervention in the Middle East (the group that sponsored the January 19th antiwar demonstration in Washington, D.C.), the official policy of the Coalition is to reject any work with the LaRouchians. Although the LaRouchians and their supporters involved them-

selves in Coalition activities during the Gulf War, these incidents did not reflect the official policy of the Coalition, according to several Coalition spokespersons, but were attempts (sometimes successful) by the LaRouchians and their allies to portray themselves as part of the Coalition.

Specifically, in interviews with several Coalition spokespersons the following picture of how the LaRouchians manipulated and exploited the Coalition emerged:

- The Rev. James Bevel had not been invited to the January 4th Coalition press conference featuring former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark which was aired on the C-SPAN cable channel. Bevel arrived with an invited speaker, a Black serviceman resisting assignment to the Gulf. Although Bevel had worked with the LaRouchians for many months prior to the press conference, it was not until weeks after the press conference that Coalition leadership became aware that Bevel had ties to the LaRouche organization.
- People affiliated with the Coalition, who defended the appearance of Bevel, were reacting to Bevel's past history as a respected civil rights leader, and were not aware, or found it impossible to accept, that Bevel had now aligned himself with far-right groups.
- A contingent of LaRouchians who marched in the Coalition's January 19th demonstration in Washington, D.C. did so against the expressed wishes of Coalition leadership.
- A security marshal who told demonstrators on January 19th not to continue a chant critical of the LaRouchians was unaware of who the LaRouchians were, and was merely trying to enforce the policy of ensuring peaceful relations among contingents.
- Although Ramsey Clark has chosen not to say anything critical of the LaRouchians due to his representation of them in legal matters, the Coalition does not hesitate to criticize roundly the LaRouchians as fascists and anti-Semites.
- The apparent reluctance among some persons affiliated with the Coalition to discuss charges of LaRouchian involvement with reporters did not reflect the views of the leadership of the Coalition, and in some cases

appears to reflect a disbelief among these persons that the LaRouchians had managed successfully to portray themselves as part of the Coalition.

- December, 1990 and January, 1991 were chaotic and confusing months and the official position of the Coalition regarding a refusal to work with the LaRouchians was perhaps not made clear to all persons actively organizing Coalition events around the country.
- While the LaRouchians appear to abuse their legal relationship to attorney Clark by using his name in their publicity and implying his political support, it is the firm belief of the Coalition that Clark's refusal to comment on this circumstance reflects a personal ethical position, and in no way implies any connection between Clark and the political work of the LaRouchians.

Leaders of the National Coalition to Stop U.S. Intervention in the Middle East are aware that the LaRouchians continue to attempt to penetrate their organization, and urge persons who find LaRouchians portraying themselves as official members of the Coalition to challenge that claim. Anyone who continues to claim the Coalition tolerates the presence of the LaRouchians should be referred to the national office of the Coalition for a short and clear rejection of that contention.

"We do not work with fascists or anti-Semites," said Coalition coordinator Gavrielle Gemma, "and that includes the LaRouchites." Gemma says this is not only the Coalition attitude, but her own as well, noting that she once personally threw some LaRouchians off a picket line during the Greyhound strike.

Apparently the position of the Coalition leadership against working with the LaRouchians, now clearly unequivocal, was slow to reach all organizers during the chaotic months of December, 1990 and January, 1991. This lack of clarity among rank-and-file organizers, some of whom were inexperienced, coupled with the LaRouchians' manipulative opportunism, the Coalition's uncertainty over Bevel's tie to the LaRouchians, and Ramsey Clark's silence on the LaRouchians' use of his name, created enough confusion so that some organizers for the Coalition at first defended Bevel's appearance at the January 4th press conference, and defended the participation of various LaRouchian front groups in Coalition

events. It also turns out that a report issued by the LaRouchian Schiller Institute, and cited at the January 4th press conference was in fact introduced by a LaRouchian attending the press conference as a reporter.

Chicago antiwar organizer Alynne Romo reports the local Emergency Coalition for Peace in the Middle East has "asked the LaRouchians not to participate when they have appeared at our demonstrations." According to Romo, "The LaRouche people called us several times. They told us Margaret Thatcher was behind the situation in Iraq and that she put George Bush up to it." Romo adds that "they also said they were working with Ramsey Clark as a way to get us to cooperate."

Former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark is the lead legal counsel for an appeal filed by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. and six followers convicted of loan fraud. On October 6, 1989, Clark appeared and gave oral arguments in the case before a three judge panel of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals in Richmond, Virginia to argue for the reversal of the convictions.

The right of Mr. Clark to represent the LaRouche organization is not disputed, but when the LaRouchians use his name in a political rather than legal context, problems arise. Based on several dozen interviews with antiwar activists in twenty cities, it appears that sometimes LaRouchians fund-raisers and organizers mention they work with Ramsey Clark, while other times they do not. The use by the LaRouchians of Clark's name has been very effective at college student government meetings where many students have never heard of LaRouche, and tend to be sympathetic to his claims of government harassment. After gaining an audience, the LaRouchians encourage the student leaders to join their "coalition" and to authorize college funding.

Sam Schwartz, a faculty member at Bronx Community College in New York, received a phone call from a LaRouche attorney threatening to sue Schwartz penniless unless he stopped telling students that LaRouche was an anti-Semite and fascist. Several African-Americans active in St. Louis who objected to the presence of the LaRouchians in a local antiwar coalition were also threatened with lawsuits for their critical characterization of the LaRouche movement. Clark has not been involved in these threats of lawsuits.

Since Clark took on the LaRouche appeal, the LaRouchians have blazoned Clark's name across a

substantial amount of propaganda used both in fund-raising and in coaxing persons into consideration of the political message of the organization. Sometimes the LaRouchian references to Clark simply cause confusion. One antiwar activist who was handed a LaRouchian pamphlet mentioning Clark was at first convinced the LaRouchians were cleverly trying to smear Clark by using his name.

The LaRouchians frequently attempt to build coalitions in a sly manner. For instance activist Lanny Sinkin, a former attorney for the Christic Institute, appeared at a March, 1991 post-war panel sponsored by a Washington, D.C. group called The Time is Now. Also on the panel were two key LaRouche operatives and a leader of The Time is Now. According to a staff member of the Washington Peace Center, members of The Time is Now worked closely with the LaRouchians and thoroughly disrupted the political work of the Washington Area Coalition to Stop U.S. Intervention in the Middle East during January and February, 1991. When members of The Time is Now passed out LaRouche's *Executive Intelligence Review* at a February meeting, they were asked to leave the coalition. When criticized by the Peace Center staffer, Sinkin defended his appearance at the conference as legitimate outreach, according to the staffer.

Sinkin says he was unaware when invited that LaRouchians would also be on the panel, and he vigorously denies that he has ever had any ongoing relationship with the LaRouchians or that his actions were improper. Sinkin says that his appearance reflected his commitment to speaking to broad audiences. Organizers at the Washington Peace Center counter that Sinkin's presence at the meeting lent credibility to two groups that were disrupting their work.

The issue here is not one of implying any type of ongoing relationship between Sinkin and the LaRouchians. No such relationship exists. But for the Washington Peace Center, Sinkin's appearance on the same platform with the LaRouchians served as an implicit endorsement, suggesting by example that joint work with the LaRouchians was acceptable at the same time that the Peace Center was telling members of the local antiwar coalition that joint work with the LaRouchians was unacceptable.

A number of experienced antiwar activists warn that working with the LaRouchians and other far-right and bigoted forces will only discredit serious work towards peace in the Middle East. Jon Hillson

is a seasoned political organizer and peace activist based in Ohio who already knew the history of the LaRouchians. Hillson reported LaRouche organizers at events sponsored by the Cleveland Committee Against War in the Persian Gulf. At one meeting, "Two people went through the crowd handing out LaRouche's *New Federalist*," says Hillson. "I was shocked, but then I realized most students had never heard of LaRouche," says Hillson. "I would urge people to disavow any collaboration with them because of their past ties to government agencies...and their homophobic, racist, sexist, and anti-Semitic agenda." Hillson notes that it will take patience to explain to new activists why a broad-based coalition should exclude anyone, but that the task of educating people that coalitions with fascists should be rejected is not one to be ignored.

How the LaRouchians Exploit Ramsey Clark

An *Associated Press* (AP) account of Clark's Fourth Circuit oral arguments noted that "former Attorney General Ramsey Clark, chief attorney for LaRouche's appeal, argued that U.S. District Judge Albert V. Bryan Jr. of Alexandria allowed only thirty-four days from arraignment to trial and failed to adequately question jurors on how much they knew about the defendant."

The Fourth Circuit ruled against LaRouche, saying LaRouche's original attorneys had waited eighteen days before asking for a continuance. An AP story about the decision reported that the appeals panel "also said LaRouche's attorneys made no attempt to press potential jurors to determine 'individually anyone who had ever heard of LaRouche,' although certain jurors who said they were familiar with the case or who had worked in law enforcement or had accounting or tax backgrounds were questioned individually."

On further appeal, the U.S. Supreme Court let the convictions stand without a hearing or comment.

In fact, more than a few civil libertarians agree there was evidence of misconduct in the government's investigation of LaRouche, and the closing of LaRouche's newspaper *New Solidarity* in a federal bankruptcy proceeding raised serious constitutional issues. Still, there is no clear evidence that the alleged government misconduct had a direct bearing

on the criminal prosecution of LaRouche and his aides.

When Clark has spoken at LaRouchian-sponsored press conferences concerning the case, there has been extensive coverage in the LaRouchian press. One such story featuring Clark appeared in LaRouche's *New Federalist* on October 13, 1989. Clark was quoted as saying that even though he had once been a political opponent of LaRouche, he had now come to his defense because of constitutional abuses such as a fast jury selection process, massive prejudicial pretrial publicity, and a jury pool which contained numerous government employees, including law enforcement agents from agencies that had allegedly targeted LaRouche.

Ramsey Clark has steadfastly refused to disassociate his legal work for the LaRouchians from the political work of the LaRouchians, despite the fact that the LaRouchians imply Clark's support in numerous newspaper and magazine articles. Most critics of Clark's silence regarding the LaRouchians say they understand he has a duty as an attorney to represent the LaRouchians fully and vigorously, but feel he has not been sensitive to the ways in which the LaRouchians are using his name in the political arena. These critics point out that the ethical imperatives for an attorney are different than the moral obligations of a leader of an antiwar movement. They say Clark has a political responsibility to distance himself from the LaRouche organization, which is separate from his role as their attorney.

Sometimes it appears that Clark's support of the LaRouche cause has moved beyond mere legal representation. According to the July 6, 1990 *New Federalist*, on June 19, 1990, Clark spoke at a private meeting coordinated with the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), a multi-governmental association and human rights forum that solicits input from non-governmental groups. The *New Federalist* reported that "Clark's trip was sponsored by the Schiller Institute's Commission to Investigate Human Rights Violations, a non-governmental organization which is urging the CSCE to take up the case of Lyndon LaRouche, the U.S. economist and statesman who is now America's most prominent political prisoner." The Schiller Institute is a LaRouchian front group which once published a book claiming British Jews helped put Hitler into power.

In his CSCE speech, Clark is reported to have said he had reviewed a random selection of sixty-

five published articles on LaRouche appearing in the several years prior to LaRouche's prosecution. Clark reportedly said "here you see that he's called every bad thing you can imagine—Nazi, anti-Semitic, violence-prone, thief—over and over again. Vilification...it was absolutely astounding."

The *New Federalist* article reported that Clark said that LaRouche was prosecuted on "economic crimes that didn't exist, because this was a political movement, it was not a for-profit activity and wasn't intended to be a for-profit activity, it was a political movement. You make three sentences for five years each to impose a fifteen-year sentence on a man who's sixty-six years old. To destroy a political movement. Obviously....Unless you can wrench [the political process] free from [the] plutocracy that absolutely controls with an iron hand that essentially one-party system, you won't have that change. And that's what the Lyndon LaRouche case is about: you."

At a February 28, 1991 international conference in Algeria to oppose U.S. intervention in the Gulf, Clark shared the podium with long-time LaRouche associate Jacques Cheminade, president of the Schiller Institute in France.

Clark Responds

Clark confirmed in an interview that he had spoken about the LaRouche case in Europe at the CSCE conference, but said he had not seen the transcript of his speech that appeared in LaRouche's *New Federalist*, and said his speech was not written in advance so he had no copy. If the report of Clark's comments in *New Federalist* are accurate—and to a large degree they reflect wording in the appeals brief he signed—then there are serious questions as to what he thinks of the LaRouchians. Clark seems to discount as propaganda the charges that the LaRouchians are fascists, anti-Semites, or neo-Nazis. Other critics question Mr. Clark's decision to appear at the CSCE-related meeting at all, pointing out that such appearances go beyond legal representation.

Clark said he had not seen any materials suggesting the LaRouche people were using his name to organize students and others into their antiwar work but he would like to see that material or any other related information. But Clark seemed relatively unconcerned that the LaRouchians might be using or abusing his name in their political work.

"That's a risk you always have," as a defense counsel, said Clark.

Clark said that the somewhat glowing description of the LaRouche political movement in the appeals brief he signed reflected the right of any defendant to portray itself in a positive light.

According to Clark, the prosecution of LaRouche in Virginia was a travesty of procedure and a clear violation of the Constitutional right to a fair trial. Clark said the issue was not whether or not the LaRouche people were guilty of crimes, but whether or not they had received a fair trial. On the question of representation of controversial clients on legal appeals, Clark said:

It's a question of rights, not a question of facts. I remain focused on the legal rights and not the nature of the person involved. I oppose the death penalty on principle, I assume many of the people who I represent on death penalty appeals are in fact guilty, but that is not the point. If you have to apologize first you have done a disservice to the case. I resist government abuses of people's rights. The government demonizes people...once you have conceded the demon you have lost the principle involved in the defense. By prefacing a defense by first saying 'of course, he is a terrible person' it disables people from considering the matter fairly.

Clark said the government had demonized people like Saddam Hussein and Lyndon LaRouche and that he felt it was not appropriate to give in to the pejorative labeling of such persons when discussing their activities. This is the same rationale used by Clark in 1986 when he was criticized for not distancing himself from his client Karl Linnas, a Nazi collaborator who was eventually deported because he had lied about his past to gain entrance to the U.S. after World War II. Clark represented Linnas in an appeal which objected to the procedures followed in the deportation. Critics of Clark, including Daniel Levitas of the Center for Democratic Renewal, said Clark was insensitive to the fact that anti-Semitic and pro-Nazi groups were using Clark's appeal to buttress their claims that Linnas was innocent or that the Holocaust was a hoax.²³

Rev. James Bevel

The Rev. James Bevel is an African-American minister from Chicago with a long history of civil rights work but a recent reputation as an opportunist who has swung far to the right. Rev. Bevel now works closely with groups controlled by two neo-fascists, the Rev. Sun Myung Moon and Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. The Moon network supported the war effort, while the LaRouchians did not. Bevel focused his energy in opposing the Gulf War, primarily through an alliance with the LaRouchians. Bevel's ties to the LaRouchians go back several years. Bevel not only appeared as a panelist at the LaRouchian antiwar conference in Chicago, but he also has endorsed LaRouche's congressional candidacy, and speaks regularly at LaRouchian forums. Bevel has served on committees created by several LaRouchian front groups, and writes a column for the LaRouchian newspaper *New Federalist*. Bevel has been an effective organizer for the LaRouchians, and took a high profile in their antiwar organizing.

Dr. Manning Marable, in a 1986 column, listed Bevel among a small group of "prominent civil rights spokesmen [who] have gone so far as to form alliances with ultra-right groups, which might give lip service to blacks' traditional interests." The LaRouchians have sought coalitions with local African-American community activists for many years, often working through religious leaders. A recent example was the LaRouchian support for then Washington, D.C. Mayor Marion Barry. During Barry's trial on drug charges, the LaRouchians and the Nation of Islam helped organize protests on behalf of Barry. The LaRouchian representative during these protests was Bevel.

When Bevel endorsed Lyndon LaRouche's congressional candidacy (in Virginia's 10th Congressional District), he signed a statement which included the claim, "Lyndon LaRouche is known and respected in every nation of the Third World as the primary opponent of the genocide policies of the IMF and as the architect and principal spokesman for a new and more just world economic order that

guarantees the inalienable rights of all people." The statement speaks glowingly of LaRouche's early theorizing about the AIDS virus and his recommendations for fighting the spread of the virus. In fact, as mentioned before, LaRouche has written that history would not judge harshly those persons who took to the streets and beat homosexuals to death with baseball bats to stop the spread of AIDS.

Bevel represented the LaRouchian Schiller Institute in Omaha, Nebraska. The *Omaha World-Herald* reported on January 6, 1991:

"Bevel was one of 10 people who came to Nebraska in October as members of a group calling itself the Citizens Fact-Finding Commission to Investigate Human rights Violations of Children in Nebraska. That group was organized by the Schiller Institute of Washington, D.C., and Wiesbaden, Germany. The institute was founded in 1984 by Helga Zepp-LaRouche. She is the wife of Lyndon LaRouche, who is serving a 15-year sentence for fraud and tax evasion....The Schiller group's printed statement disputed the findings of two grand juries in the Franklin case. A check by the World-Herald of some of the 'facts' in the statement turned up several apparent errors.

While Rev. Bevel's historic role as a valued civil rights leader is unquestioned, he has in recent years lost his constituency and his political moorings. Dr. Manning Marable noted in 1986 that Bevel, had become "a Republican party leader in Chicago's Black community, and soon earned the reputation as an extremist of the right."

Some time after the LaRouche conviction in January 1989, Bevel began to appear as a featured speaker at LaRouchian conferences, and began to write a column in the LaRouchian *New Federalist*. As Marable noted in 1986:

The right-wing sect of Lyndon LaRouche has also initiated a campaign to recruit black supporters. As in the case of the Unification Church, the LaRouchians work primarily through several fronts, the Schiller

23 A strident attack on Clark written by John Judis which appeared in the neo-conservative magazine *New Republic*, conflated Clark's work with the LaRouchians and his support for a variety of liberal and progressive issues. Rather than raising a principled criticism of Clark, the article was a vehicle for a denunciation of the left in general and its views on the Gulf War in particular.

Institute and the National Democratic Policy Committee. Again, the LaRouchians have been linked to a number of racist and extremist groups, including the Liberty Lobby, the Klan and neo-Nazis. Currently, the LaRouchians are vigorously opposing sanctions against South African apartheid.

While in Chicago, Bevel regularly broke ranks with the African-American-led coalition behind the late Mayor Harold Washington. At the same time, Bevel was working with Moon's front group CAUSA. In an interview with Bevel at an Illinois CAUSA meeting, I asked him why he would ally himself with a religious/political movement such as that run by Rev. Moon. Bevel replied that it was a tactical coalition based on agreement that the main danger in the world was communism. Bevel argued that communism was a godless philosophy, and that as a Christian, it was his obligation to fight godlessness.

Bevel's CAUSA ties garnered him some unflattering publicity. According to the December 12, 1987 *Chicago Sun-Times*, Bevel was one of four persons belonging to "groups created by the Rev. Sun Myung Moon's Unification Church" who erected a creche and nativity scene at Chicago's Daley Center Plaza. The *Chicago Sun-Times* reported that "William J. Grutzmacher, who obtained the permit and paid \$2000 for the creche, gave a speech in October to a business group in Merrillville, Ind., apparently so anti-Semitic that a local newspaper ran an editorial denouncing him." The head of the Rotary Club that had co-sponsored Grutzmacher's speech told the reporter, "He made charges...that the Communist Party is headed by Jews, and that the Jews were responsible for every negative thing that has happened since World War II."

Bevel has also worked with other Moon fronts. In the October, 1990 issue of *American Freedom Journal*, Bevel is listed as serving on the National Policy Board of the American Freedom Coalition, chaired by the ultra-conservative Hon. Richard Ichord. The American Freedom Coalition (AFC) is a joint project of Rev. Moon and the Rev. Robert G. Grant of the ultra-right Christian fundamentalist group Christian Voice. AFC fundraised for Oliver North, and Bevel sits on the AFC National Policy Board with Maj. Gen. John K. Singlaub, implicated in the Iran-Contra scandal; Lt. Gen. Daniel Graham of High Frontier, the pro-Star Wars lobby; and

rightist historian Dr. Cleon Skousen. The late Dr. Ralph David Abernathy was a long-time member of the AFC Board of Directors along with pro-interventionist Ambassador Phillip Sanchez. On the AFC National Advisory Board sit rightist fundraising guru Richard Viguerie, and Slava Stetsko, president of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN). ABN is notorious because it is the descendant and spiritual heir of the Committee of Subjugated Nations, formed in 1943 by Hitler's allies. According to author Russ Bellant, "The ABN brought together fascist forces from Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Ukraine, the Baltic States, Slovenia and other nations." Slava Stetsko is the widow of Yaroslav Stetsko, leader of the Nazi puppet government in the Ukraine during World War II. She once wrote a glowing introduction to a book that defined anti-Semitism as a "smear word used by Communists against those who effectively oppose and expose them."

These are the fascist forces with which Bevel has allied himself, and is a striking example of the opportunistic flexibility of fascism as a political ideology, able not only to embrace Nazi-collaborators but also to entice Black civil rights activists. Bevel's ties to the fascist Moon circles are through a shared loathing of communism as a godless ideology, an issue which resonates with many Black church-based constituencies. Another congruent theme that fascism can employ to seek alliances with African-Americans and Hispanic-Americans is the opportunistic manipulation of the issues of nationalism and self determination.

Other Black leaders such as Roy Innis and the late Ralph David Abernathy have forged alliances with the fascist right. Innis has worked in alliance with the LaRouchians. Abernathy worked with Moon's Unification movement until his death.

Other Right-Wing Groups and the Gulf War

Conservative groups overwhelmingly supported sending U.S. troops to the Gulf. Right-wing forces aligned with Rev. Sun Myung Moon and those supportive of the Israeli political right forged

fashion, with an introduction by the editors where Farrakhan's movement was described as "based on the cultivation of spiritual, education, and family values, as well as racial separation."

The idea of racial or national organicism, that leaders emerged from homogeneous national groupings and metaphysically expressed the collective will of the people, was a basic tenet of fascism, especially the form of fascism called national socialism. In the 1988 report of the small American Nazi Party in Chicago, the term national socialism was defined as "the organized will of the race, in its quest for racial survival, and physical, mental, and spiritual self betterment." One modern offshoot of national socialism, called the "Third Position," has adherents in both Europe and the United States, and is known for its attempts to build bridges to the left, especially around the issues of protecting the environment and support for the working class.

Racist nationalism, anti-Jewish bigotry, and fascist principles have provided a basis in the past for white supremacists and anti-Jewish bigots such as Tom Metzger to voice support for Farrakhan. The October 12, 1985 *New York Times* reported on a Michigan meeting of white supremacists where Metzger told his audience of neo-Nazis and Klan members, "America is like a rotting carcass. The Jews are living off the carcass like the parasites they are. Farrakhan understands this." That meeting was attended by Political Research Associates author and freelance journalist Russ Bellant who reported the Metzger quote and incidentally disclosed the attendance of another white supremacist, Roy Frankhouser, a former Ku Klux Klan leader from Pennsylvania who was for many years a top security consultant to Lyndon LaRouche.

The beginning of the 1990's saw increasing joint political work between various LaRouchian front groups and Rev. Farrakhan's Black nationalist Nation of Islam (NOI). For instance, the NOI's newspaper *Final Call* ran an article by Carlos

Wesley on Panama in its issue of May 31, 1990, which was credited as a reprint from the LaRouchian magazine *Executive Intelligence Review*. The LaRouchian *New Federalist* has run several articles praising the political work of Dr. Abdul Alim Muhammad, editor of NOI's *Final Call*.

Another group allied with Farrakhan that promotes the idea of racial or national organicism is the political organization run by Dr. Fred Newman, a former protege of LaRouche. Persons who extol Newman's idiosyncratic form of "social therapy" control a variety of political organizations under Newman's influence, including the New Alliance Party (NAP), Rainbow Lobby, New York's Castillo Cultural Center, and various Centers for Short-Term Therapy. NAP promotes the political theories of Farrakhan, the Rev. Al Sharpton, and Dr. Lenora Fulani, presidential candidate of the New Alliance Party. The Rainbow Lobby has forged a working coalition with both the Libertarian Party and the racialist and neo-fascist Populist Party to challenge state laws limiting ballot access. At the same time NAP's Lenora Fulani stood side-by-side with Al Sharpton and other Black nationalists in the summer of 1991 as they inflamed an already tense and tragic situation in the Crown Heights neighborhood in Brooklyn, which has seen a long-simmering dispute between Blacks and a sect of Orthodox Jews.

It is of interest that the Afrikan Anti-Zionist Front was first announced in Tripoli, Libya and that Muammar Qaddafi is praised as a "premier fighter for justice." Qaddafi has sponsored several international conferences promoting racial nationalism and cultivating ideas congruent with Third Position ideology. There are hints of Third Position themes in the rhetoric of the Afrikan Anti-Zionist Front, Farrakhan's Nation of Islam, and the New Alliance Party's Lenora Fulani and Fred Newman. Journalist Howard Goldenthal of Toronto has explored this situation, but much more research is needed to understand this complex turn of events.

Fascists as Information Sources

We are all aware that there are shifting factions in political groups, government bureaucracies, and intelligence agencies. Even though there is an historic overlap of government repression and reactionary politics, at the same time, factions of the right have from time to time made a tactical decision to expose government wrongdoing to smash an opposing faction on the right or derail a bothersome government project.

Around the world the right has adopted a strategy of tension to smash the center, and one part of that strategy is to seek temporary tactical alliances with left groups in attacking government policies. The left/right alliance seeks to displace the center, but historically the right always triumphs and then smashes the left. This is certainly one lesson of Italian fascism and German national socialism. Do we really think a corrupt wealthy anti-labor repressive centrist power is worse than fascist power? As the health of the American economy declines, it will generate a move towards alternative political viewpoints and either new political parties or realignment of current parties. A left/right alliance under such circumstances would be precarious and dangerous.

Serious anti-repression researchers frequently find themselves in contact with elements of the ruling center, opposition centrist parties, and far right in the normal course of their research. The mere contact between left and right is not the issue, but when left researchers become *de facto* conduits for the right's information, and do so uncritically and without revealing their sources at least by general description, serious ethical and pragmatic problems arise.

Progressive Researchers & Fascist Sources

There is little agreement among progressive researchers and journalists on how material from far-right sources should be handled. Some progressive researchers are suspicious that government intelligence agents and rightist researchers may leak information to progressive journalists to achieve a right-wing political goal, perhaps as part of a faction fight over government foreign policy strategies.

Herb Quinde is one of the main LaRouchian intelligence contacts for reporters in the Washington, D.C. area. Quinde boasts that the LaRouchians maintain ties with a network of current and former intelligence agents and military specialists who oppose current U.S. foreign policy and its reliance on covert action over direct military engagement.

Quinde confirms that he and his fellow LaRouchian investigators are in constant touch with journalists and researchers across the political spectrum. In several interviews in 1990 and 1991 Quinde refused to go on the record with the names of any of his regular contacts among left political groups and critics of government repression, although he bragged that such contacts are a regular part of his work.

While Christic now says they no longer have any contact with the LaRouchians, some former Christic staff seem willing to keep some doors open. Investigators formerly connected to Christic have maintained information ties to the LaRouchians, and advised progressive researchers to rely on the LaRouchians as experts in the area of government intelligence abuse. These referrals have over a period of several years helped forge an information exchange network that has drawn some left researchers, journalists and radio talk show hosts fur-

ther into unsubstantiated conspiracy theories and into ongoing relationships with fascist and anti-Jewish groups and individuals.

David MacMichael still maintains close ties to Herb Quinde, meets with him personally, and advises researchers probing government intelligence abuse to contact Quinde for help. MacMichael defends his association with Quinde as legitimate, albeit sometimes embarrassing.

Russ Bellant is the author of *Old Nazis, The New Right and the Republican Party* and has extensively studied Nazi-linked emigre intelligence and political networks. In the course of his research, he has found several authors in this field who have developed a working relationship with LaRouchians. Bellant says he raised the ethical problems of working with the LaRouchians with these authors, generally to no avail.

To be sure, there is no consensus among reporters, mainstream or progressive, on what is an ethical way to deal with information from groups such as the LaRouchians.

According to Peter Dale Scott, "My own ground rules are that until something happens where I feel someone is manipulating me or they have personally done something horrible that I feel is objectionable, I feel it is a matter of intellectual freedom to keep the lines of communication open. As long as they deal with me as a human being I will treat them as such." Scott, however, balked at signing a petition about LaRouche being a victim of human rights abuse because he felt there was "enough evidence to show the LaRouche people were probably guilty of some criminal conduct."

Author Jonathan Marshall, now with the *San Francisco Chronicle*, says the LaRouchians "have given me information, but given their history, I never take it at face value." Marshall says "sometimes they are a source of good leads, their work on Panama has been of particular use." Marshall does not accept the LaRouchian premise that Noriega was a humanitarian, but neither does he accept the idea that Noriega was pure. "Here you have a case of evil versus evil, and the enemies of someone are often a good place to go for information." According to Marshall, he will sometimes pursue LaRouchian leads, "and then do my own independent research." If something turns up, he considers it his own effort, and does not credit the LaRouchians, in part, he admits, because it would lessen his credibility as a journalist.

"If you look across the board at cultish groups that do 'research' you find sometimes that they have found amazing documents that do in fact check out," says Marshall. But he hastens to add that "documents are one thing, but accepting their analysis is simply not responsible."

In the late 1980's author Carl Oglesby considered working with LaRouchian Herb Quinde to unravel the story of the recruitment of the Gehlen Nazi spy apparatus into U.S. intelligence. Oglesby comments:

If Quinde had been able to provide even a single scrap of useful information I would have turned a cartwheel in excitement, but he never did. Everything he sent me was bullshit. He was trying to convince me to depend on the LaRouche information network. He was always boasting about the documents he could send me, but he never gave me a useful thing about Gehlen or anything else about the Nazification of U.S. intelligence.

During the Gulf War, Quinde asked Oglesby to speak at a LaRouchian antiwar conference, but Oglesby declined, "because whatever Herb's essential charm and persuasion, I would never publicly associate myself with them, primarily because my friends warn me it would damage my credibility. In fact, I've never initiated a contact with them." Putting up with an occasional phone call from Quinde is one thing, said Oglesby, but appearing at a conference is another. Still, Oglesby isn't convinced that they are really a neo-Nazi outfit. "My advice is not to make such a big deal about this guy. I think that he is basically comic relief." Oglesby, however, is suspicious of the actual purpose of the LaRouchians:

I think it's an intelligence operation, and the only question is what's animating it. I don't think it is, strictly speaking, an organization representing one individual—LaRouche. I believe it has access to sources of information that reflect official circuits, most likely European, but I don't think he's officially CIA or FBI. I think U.S. intelligence is a little baffled by them too, although in the first few years of the Reagan Administration they clearly allowed them privileged access.

Journalists James Ridgeway and David MacMichael have defended their contacts with the

LaRouchian network as part of the standard journalistic practice of cultivating a wide range of sources of information. They and other journalists argue that taking information from someone in no way implies any agreement whatsoever with the information provider. In fact, reporters at a number of mainstream daily newspapers admit off-the-record that they frequently receive material from the LaRouchians, and in some cases develop stories from the documents supplied by the LaRouchians. Ridgeway, however, acknowledges that the LaRouchians are a "neo-Nazi or fascist movement" and warns that journalists need to exercise extreme caution when contacting them for information.

This is a real issue since a score of progressive researchers and journalists report that in the past two years, operatives from the LaRouchians and the far-right have stepped up their attempts to forge working relationships with them over the basis of shared criticism of the government.

A West Coast journalist, Ed Connolly, recalls an incident in the fall of 1990:

I was tracking a story on Air Force Intelligence and I called everyone I could think of. Two weeks later Gene Wheaton called me, which was odd because I hadn't called him. Wheaton tells me, "You know the people who have very good intelligence on these things are the LaRouche people, you should call the people that put out Executive Intelligence Review, call Herb Quinde." So I did, but they wanted more information than they were willing to give out and I was immediately skeptical. I never talked to them again.

Eugene Wheaton, an early adviser to the Christic Institute, accepted an invitation to speak at the December, 1990 LaRouche antiwar conference in Chicago.

Journalist Jim Naurekas of Fairness and Accuracy in Reporting (FAIR) bemoans the fact that LaRouchian Herb Quinde has followed him through three jobs trying to pester him with tidbits of information. One academic who wrote a 1990 article on government civil liberties infringements in a left journal says she was quickly contacted by several persons who recommended she share her material with *Spotlight* and other far-right anti-Jewish publications.

Russ Bellant is highly critical of those who tolerate or apologize for people who work with the

LaRouchians, the Populist Party or the Liberty Lobby network. "I think you discredit yourself when you work with these bigoted forces," says Bellant, "and mere association tends to lend credence to these rightist groups because people assume the group can't be that bad if a respected person on the left is associated with them."

Bellant warns that some of the LaRouchian documents may be forged. "They did create a passable bogus copy of a section of the *New York Times* blasting their enemies," he points out. Bellant thinks the LaRouchians "don't give you anything that you can rely on," and that by talking with them about research issues, "you allow them to track what you are up to which lets them go back to their Nazi friends and report on you to them."

Bellant and others say they are not troubled by intellectual curiosity and open-mindedness that bridge ideological lines, but they do have concerns when left and right groups and individuals forge covert relationships.

There is a big difference between reading books by or interviewing members of far-right and racist groups, and working in what amounts to an ad-hoc investigative coalition with members of these groups. There is a serious difference of opinion among progressive researchers as to the propriety of working with the LaRouchians or other ultra-right groups, especially those that preach bigotry. Some say they cannot, in good conscience, even accept unsolicited information from such groups, while others argue they need to interview members of these groups for their research.

Journalist Jane Hunter says she has consistently rejected overtures from the anti-Jewish far right. Hunter is highly critical of anyone who would covertly or overtly work with racists, anti-Jewish bigots, or neo-Nazis. She notes that even on a pragmatic level, "Any information that these people have is bound to show up someplace, free for the taking, for what it's worth. Our energies need to be spent in reaching out to people who are victims of the system—the people with whom we share a common interest in changing it."

Hunter and some two-dozen other progressive researchers (including the author) have been discussing these issues for several years. The one point of agreement is that this is a problem long overdue for debate. As Hunter explains, "In my speaking engagements I have found in audience questions an alarming increase in conspiracy theories and anti-

Semitism." She also is worried that as conditions for African-Americans in the U.S. have continued to deteriorate, there has been an increase in the scapegoating of Jews by African-Americans. While scapegoating and turning to conspiracy theories is a common phenomenon in communities experiencing financial or social stress, it should never be tolerated.

Not all the rightist groups seeking an alliance or information exchange with the left are bigoted or fascist. Some are principled conservatives or libertarians seeking an open debate. However, some of the groups seeking to link up with the left have openly neo-fascist or neo-Nazi agendas, including some that call themselves conservative or libertarian. The ethical parameters on these questions for journalists and researchers need further debate.

It is important to recognize that the moral issues for persons building coalitions in the movement for peace and social justice are different than those for lawyers, academics, and reporters. For organizers the principles of unity seldom (if ever) are such that working with fascist, racist and anti-Jewish groups is appropriate.

Most people agree that uncritical reliance on either right-wing or left-wing material can lead to the recirculation of misinformation or disinformation. When working with the political right, there is the additional possibility that the left could unintentionally end up letting the right set its agenda. Some progressive researchers also argue that it is unethical for progressive groups to take information covertly from the political right and repackage and recirculate it without disclosing the source. That issue, however, remains unsettled, and needs to be debated openly.

A good illustration of the problem came up in an October 15, 1991 *Village Voice* article on the mysterious death of writer Danny Casolaro by authors James Ridgeway and Doug Vaughan. Casolaro at the time of his death was researching the legal case filed by the Inslaw corporation alleging theft and illegal sale of its software program, Promis. Promis is a program used to track complex litigation, but it can also be used to track dissidents and criminal conspiracies. Persons involved in several federal agencies are alleged to have participated in the illegal use and distribution of Promis. Casolaro had nicknamed the government and private conspiracies he perceived to be surrounding the Inslaw case "The Octopus," and had circulated a book proposal.

Ridgeway and Vaughan do report that Casolaro in the course of his research, would "head into Washington for a congressional hearing or a meeting with, for example, Danny Sheehan of the Christic Institute—whose 'Secret Team' could just as easily have been called the Octopus." They also mention that Casolaro was working with the LaRouchians in gathering information.

Not mentioned in the article is that the LaRouchians funneled information to the Christic Institute, Barbara Honegger, and the *Spotlight/Liberty* Lobby crowd; or that another named source, investigator Bill McCoy, also worked with Christic and supplied information from the LaRouchians; or that co-author Vaughan works at the Christic Institute.

Ridgeway and Vaughan do mention LaRouche's criminal conviction and the LaRouchian obsession with conspiracy theories and report, "The LaRouchies had ties to the Reagan White House and have long run a surprisingly elaborate intelligence-gathering operation of their own." They do not, however, characterize the LaRouchians as fascists or anti-Semites.

In the course of the article a LaRouchian intelligence operative is cited along with other sources. Should LaRouchian sources be treated differently than any other journalistic source? Again, there is no agreement even among alternative journalists. "I have great respect for Jim Ridgeway, but to put any credence in anything a LaRouchite has to say is a leap into faith that I can't make," says *Voice* columnist Nat Hentoff. Another *Voice* writer, Robert I. Friedman says, "The LaRouchians are an anti-Semitic conspiracy organization. It's a mistake for a journalist to use LaRouchians as a source without describing the kind of organization it is." Ridgeway responds that he has characterized the LaRouchians as conspiracists, fascists, and neo-Nazis in other settings, and he thinks most people who read his column already know who the LaRouchians are.

LaRouche: Victim or Villain?

Lyndon LaRouche has picked up support for his campaign to get released from prison from a number of right-wing extremists, including retired Air Force Colonel and intelligence specialist Fletcher Prouty,

a leading light among ultra-right researchers, who also works with the quasi-Nazi Liberty Lobby. Prouty has issued a statement declaring that "instrumentalities of the government have hounded" LaRouche and "created wrongs where none existed before." The LaRouchians, however, have picked up support for their theory of a government conspiracy against LaRouche from a broader spectrum than the political right.

Both James Ridgeway and David MacMichael have reported the allegations of the LaRouchians that they are not guilty of financial crimes, but the victims of a massive government conspiracy aimed at crushing them politically.

Ridgeway, in the preface to his book on the U.S. white supremacist movement, *Blood in the Face*, omits LaRouche from a discussion of the "racist far right." Instead, Ridgeway refers to LaRouche in the context of discussing how the collapsed rural economy in the 1980's distorted the politics of the farm belt and "the whacko candidates of Lyndon LaRouche's party were serious contenders." This passing reference to LaRouche (there is one other bland paragraph in the book) places LaRouche in a discussion mentioning serious politicians such as Jesse Jackson, George McGovern, and James Hightower. This seems to characterize LaRouche as merely a strange and comical player in the electoral arena. Ridgeway says that this was not meant to imply LaRouche was not a force in farm belt fascism, but that his publisher felt that adding the LaRouchians into the book would have confused the issues.

Critics of Ridgeway's view of the LaRouchians, including this author, argue that LaRouche is in fact a neo-Nazi ideologue who should be discussed along with the Ku Klux Klan and the other white racist groups with whom the LaRouchians have associated for years. No one is suggesting that Ridgeway, who has a prodigious track record of sound investigative reporting, shares any of the LaRouchian viewpoints. But it is legitimate to ask whether or not Ridgeway's analysis and treatment of the LaRouchians has perhaps unconsciously been influenced by their value to him as a journalistic source of information on government misconduct and other issues. Ridgeway, like other reporters who cover government

repression, received packets of information from the LaRouchians for many years and sometimes relied on the material to develop a story.³⁵ This in itself is hardly unique and not necessarily questionable—other reporters do likewise.

In one case, however, Ridgeway appears to have relied on LaRouche material without independently verifying the accuracy of the material.

On May 17, 1988 James Ridgeway penned a lengthy article in the *Village Voice* titled "Dueling Spymasters: How the Government Bungled the Case Against Lyndon LaRouche."

Even a careful reading of the Ridgeway article leaves the impression that when a federal judge declared a mistrial in the Boston fraud case against LaRouche and several colleagues, it was caused by government misconduct. This is what the LaRouchians contend—but not what the judge said. Lyndon LaRouche and his associates were on trial in Boston for an alleged credit card scam. The mistrial declared by U.S. Federal District Court Judge Robert E. Keeton came after complaints of hardship were voiced by more than one third of the jurors who had been told the trial would end in early summer, and then learned it could stretch through the end of the year. The judge declared the mistrial because he feared a continuation of the trial would be a waste of time and money due to the real possibility that the number of jurors would fall below the legal limit before the trial ended.

While there was substantial evidence that the Justice Department may have improperly withheld documents relating to LaRouche in pre-trial discovery, a lengthy hearing resulted in a ruling that the documents had no bearing on the criminal charges. According to Ridgeway, "the proceedings had revealed...FBI agents planting obstruction of justice evidence on LaRouche." This is what the LaRouche attorneys sought to prove—and given the history of the FBI, Justice Department and other government bureaucracies, such an allegation was not far-fetched—but no hard evidence to prove that claim had been introduced in court at the time of the mistrial. In fact, the prosecution was still presenting its case. Further, the delay of the trial which caused the juror hardship was caused not only by lengthy side hearings into the document and informant ques-

35 This information is from three former associates of Ridgeway who asked not to be identified.

tions, but by numerous challenges and extended cross examinations by the phalanx of defense attorneys representing LaRouche, his associates and their organizations.

Legal actions by both federal and local agencies against LaRouche for questionable fundraising and financial practices commenced years before the flap over Iran-Contragate and the well-publicized airport assault involving LaRouche partisans and Henry Kissinger, who was traveling with his wife. Furthermore, there is a virtual army of persons who claim to have been swindled and victimized by LaRouche-related organizations. Ridgeway offers no evidence the Boston criminal case was a result of the government being out to get LaRouche any more than it is out to get any person accused of being a common crook.

The "seeds of the government's investigation" were not planted by a petulant Henry Kissinger, as Ridgeway asserts, but by hundreds of persons who claimed to have found unauthorized credit card charges on their monthly statements at a time in 1984 when LaRouche was buying half-hour presidential campaign spots on network television. The grand jury which indicted LaRouche heard evidence from angry credit card holders, not Henry Kissinger.

Yet Ridgeway is correct in asserting that there was government misconduct against the LaRouchians which surfaced as part of the case. That the government shut down the LaRouchian publications as part of its probe into loan fraud and tax evasion was a civil liberties outrage, and the action was later rightfully declared unconstitutional. This abuse of government power, however, had no bearing on the evidence which convicted LaRouche and his followers of the charges in the Virginia indictments.

There is no debate that LaRouche was a little fish in the cloudy waters trolled by U.S. intelligence agencies. But when LaRouche hired informants and self-styled intelligence operatives such as Ryan Quade Emerson, Mitchell WerBell, and Roy Frankhouser, he was aware he was opening a Pandora's box filled with smoke and mirrors, double-dealing, and betrayal. WerBell, for instance, was a former OSS officer and international arms merchant. Frankhouser was a well-known government informant and Ku Klux Klan organizer. While LaRouche may have been belatedly frozen out of an active role in Reagan Administration intelligence functions, to conclude that his former allies turned up as govern-

ment witnesses through a conspiracy to isolate LaRouche the "Splymaster" was a fanciful but unsubstantiated charge. A more likely explanation is that they turned up as witnesses against LaRouche in an attempt to keep themselves out of jail.

Ridgeway also describes LaRouche without mentioning LaRouche's notorious anti-Jewish sentiments. LaRouche, for instance, has claimed there is no such thing as Jewish culture, and that "only" a million and a half Jews perished at the hands of the Nazis, and then primarily due to illness and overwork.

A letter criticizing Ridgeway for publishing LaRouchian assertions as fact was published in the May 31, 1988 issue of the *Voice* over the signatures of this author and journalists Russ Bellant, Joel Bellman, Bryan Chitwood, Dennis King, Ed Kayatt, and Kalev Pehme.

David MacMichael is the editor of *Unclassified*, the newsletter of the Association of National Security Alumni (ANSA). In the Feb.-March, 1991 edition of *Unclassified*, MacMichael casually cites unnamed LaRouche sources in an article about a dismissed case involving Iran-Contragate figures Oliver North and Joseph Fernandez. "LaRouche sources point out that Prosecutor William Burch was not particularly diligent in arguing his case. They note that Burch has been active in the LaRouche prosecutions."

In the October-November 1990 issue of *Unclassified*, MacMichael presents the same story of intrigue previously reported by Ridgeway. MacMichael also mentions the LaRouchian competition with the "North-Secord enterprise for donations from wealthy individuals," implying it was connected to the LaRouche criminal prosecutions.

It is true that the Oliver North network targeted the LaRouchians for investigation, when LaRouche fundraising, especially to rich older conservatives, was found to be hampering private fundraising efforts for the Contras. There is, however, no conclusive evidence that the North/Secord political investigation of LaRouche influenced the Boston or Virginia criminal investigations or indictments.

Numerous criminal and civil actions against illegal LaRouche financial activities were launched as early as the late 1970's. One such probe was initiated by the Illinois State Attorney General on the basis of an article by this author charging irregularities in LaRouchian financial activities. The article was based on several boxes of original office and

bank records.³⁶ In 1979 and 1980, Dennis King published documented charges of widespread LaRouchian financial misconduct in a series of articles in New York's *Our Town*, a neighborhood newspaper. Several articles were based on secret internal LaRouche memos and financial records obtained by King from sources close to the LaRouche operation.

On December 16, 1981, Dennis King, Russ Bellant, and this author held a press conference in Washington, D.C. charging the LaRouchians with "a wide variety of potentially illegal activities," including: carrying out intelligence tasks for several foreign governments, including Iraq and South Africa; conducting a pattern of "illegal, deceitful and fraudulent activities by non-profit corporations, foundations and fundraising front groups controlled by Lyndon LaRouche."

The Boston grand jury was already investigating illegal LaRouchian fundraising practices well before conservatives and neo-conservatives forced the Reagan Administration to stop access by LaRouchians to the staff at the National Security Council and CIA. It is not likely that LaRouche was the victim of a conspiracy to indict him falsely for crimes. What is more likely is that after LaRouche was forced out as a marginal player in Reagan intelligence circles, his immense criminal fundraising schemes could no longer be ignored, and some of the numerous probes into his many frauds finally were allowed to proceed to court.

Certainly both MacMichael and Ridgeway have a right to report what they wish, and draw any conclusions they feel are warranted by the facts. But to report the LaRouche side of the story of the government's criminal indictments without historical context is to give an imprimatur to the unsubstantiated—and widely disputed—LaRouchian allegations claiming that LaRouche's conviction was the result of a government conspiracy to deny him his political rights. This in turn is used by the LaRouchians to gain sympathy and worm their way into left political circles, especially among students, where the LaRouchians' long history of fascist attacks on left groups is unknown.

Some Criteria for Discussion

Circulating information from (and in essence for) the political right without an accompanying notation as to source, appropriate principled criticism, and analysis of intent can have many negative outcomes. It:

- Lauanders the original source of the information which often makes independent verification more difficult;
- Builds the left group's reputation as an independent and resourceful information gatherer when in essence the information has been plagiarized;
- Gives the information an unwarranted *imprimatur* since the information is assumed to be coming from a left rather than the right source;
- Advances often unstated and implicit rightist agendas;
- Protects the rightist group from punitive attack by the right or the government since the information is perceived as coming from left;
- Results in a conscious or unconscious reluctance by the left group to criticize the right group for fear of having information flow cut off.

It is important both journalistically and politically to know the source of information in order to consider the ulterior motives and possible implications of the information being circulated.

We certainly shouldn't let the right set our research agenda through leaks but contact with the right seems inevitable and often proper and useful. Since persons on the left have contacts with the right for varied and complex reasons, one blanket criticism is neither sufficient, nor helpful. We do need to think through policies. What then are the principled conditions for contact with the right? Keep in mind that we all need to work in coalitions while maintaining independent political analysis and ability to criticize freely.

36 The boxes were purchased as scrap from a janitor by the author posing as a paper recycler after the LaRouchians were locked out of their Chicago office for non-payment of rent.

that Singlaub created the yellow ribbon campaign as a continuation of his nefarious role in Contra fundraising is to stretch credulity beyond the breaking point.

Another case involving Singlaub shows how a series of individual facts from underlying footnotes can be strung together so that the conclusions are not accurate because they fail the tests of deductive logic. *The Iran Contra Connection: Secret Teams and Covert Operations in the Reagan Era*, combines into one book chapters written by Jonathan Marshall, Peter Dale Scott and Jane Hunter. On page 67 in a chapter written by Peter Dale Scott it is asserted that the LaRouche organization "previously posed as left-wing but in fact harassed anti-nuclear and other left-wing demonstrations with the help of the right-wing domestic intelligence group known since 1979 as Western Goals."

It is documented that the LaRouchians spied on and harassed the left, and it is documented that Western Goals spied on and harassed the left, but it does not automatically follow that they worked together to spy on and harass the left.

The evidence linking the two groups is this: General Singlaub, at the time on the board of Western Goals, once lectured to a group that included some LaRouchians at a training center run by Mitch WerBell. Singlaub met LaRouchians from time to time when he visited WerBell, who served as an intelligence adviser to LaRouche. The LaRouchians in 1977 gave the New Hampshire State Police background material on anti-nuclear activists including several pages from a private Rees newsletter. At the time, Rees was not connected to Western Goals. In fact, Western Goals had not as yet been founded.

That both the LaRouchians and Rees have spied on the left is both documented and a matter of some bragging by both parties. That the LaRouchians spied on and harassed the left with help from Western Goals is unsubstantiated, and faces conflicting evidence. In fact, Rees and the LaRouchians have despised each other for years, and denounce each other regularly in print, gleefully sending nasty information about each other to reporters, including this author.

It is common for Singlaub and other figures criticized by the left to point to the inaccurate and unsubstantiated charges leveled against them by their critics as a means to deflect the charges that are well documented. The use of fallacious arguments and the circulation of unsubstantiated conclusory charges in an area of research such as government repression or intelligence abuse undermines the credibility of the whole area of research. It makes the job all the harder for cautious progressive researchers, whose work becomes suspect in the eyes of mainstream reporters and broad audiences.

Harry Martin and Propaganda Techniques

Harry V. Martin is the editor of the *Napa Sentinel*. His articles on government corruption have gained popularity on the left. An analysis of the content and style of the Martin articles raises questions about his credibility as a reporter. Martin uses classic leaps of logic and propaganda techniques in his reporting. This section will look at several articles which Martin has written concerning the pending Inslaw court case.

Inslaw, a small computer company, developed a very sensitive computer program, Promis, which Inslaw alleges was appropriated without authorization by the U.S. Justice Department and other government agencies. Promis software was an early contender in case management software, but by no means unique. Several vendors at the time Promis was being offered also offered similar case tracking software. It can be argued that at the time Promis was indeed ahead of its competitors in many key features, but today Lotus Agenda with its case tracking overlay is just as powerful.³⁹

Martin's Inslaw stories use the classical propaganda technique of stringing together chronological events and implying that one causes the other. One story, for example, which looks at the role governmental retribution may have played in the failure to re-appoint to the bench one judge, George Bason, whose rulings has supported Inslaw's position. Mar-

39 The author has written a column on computer technology for the legal community for almost six years (first in the *Chicago Lawyer* and now *Illinois Legal Times*) and is familiar with case tracking software, both early versions and current versions. I base my opinion on representations made in court documents and newspaper accounts regarding Promis. I have tested Lotus Agenda based on copies given me by Lotus for review.