

## **“LENINIST BOOMERS” BUILD “THE FIFTH INTERNATIONAL”: THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE LABOR COMMITTEE (PLUS THE OLD MOLE AND NEW MOLE FILES!)**

*Introduction: This series of FactNet posts provides the most detailed look at the early history of the NCLC from LaRouche’s leaving the SWP in late 1965 to the major faction fight inside the organization in 1971. The files focus most on the early NCLC in two key cities, New York and Philadelphia. However there is some mention of the NCLC group in Baltimore as well as a detailed picture of the early European organization.*

*As part of the research, LaRouche Planet includes two detailed series of posts by Hylozoic Hedgehog (dubbed “the Old Mole Files” and “the New Mole Files”) based on archival research. Much of the discussion involves the proto-LaRouche grouping and its role in SDS, the Columbia Strike, and the New York Teachers Strike in New York as well as the group’s activity in Philadelphia.*

*Finally, this series of posts can also be read as a continuation of the story of LaRouche and the NCLC begun by the “New Study” also posted on LaRouche Planet which covers LaRouche’s history from his early years in New Hampshire and Massachusetts to his relocating to New York City in the early 1950s and his activity inside the Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party (SWP) until he left the SWP in late 1965.*

### **WAYBACK to 1966: How it all began**

---

**The Free University and CIPA: Origins of the SDS Labor Committees.** (More notes from the archives)

“For two years, beginning during the Summer of 1966; the Marcus class at a ramshackle New York Free School premises on New York City’s 14th Street was the motor for the growth of a tiny group, the hard core of the future Labor Committees.” -- From: The Conceptual History of the Labor Committees by L. Marcus in the *CAMPAIGNER*, Vol.7, n°10, Oct. 1974.

In 1966 Lyndon LaRouche (“Lynn Marcus”) first began teaching his classes in Marxist Economics at the Free University of New York (“FUNY”) on 20 East 14th Street, just off Union Square. FUNY -- two big rooms in a loft that had been divided into five classrooms -- had begun as part of a broader SDS project to create Free Universities across the United States. It was administered by Allen Krebs, an economics professor

close to the Progressive Labor Party (PLP) and the PL-dominated May 2nd Movement (M-2-M). PLP – a pro-Maoist splinter group from the American Communist Party would disband M-2-M in February 1966 and return to a more buttoned-down version of Marxism. Jim Mellon -- another M-2-M member who would later be instrumental in founding the Weatherman -- also was involved in running FUNY.

[For a brief description of FUNY, see Edward Grossman, “New York’s Schoolhouse for the Left,” in the April 1966 issue of *Harper’s*. Grossman reports that FUNY had come under attack from the right-wing NY press for encouraging draft-dodging. It also attracted the anger of the NY police department as well as the “reform democrats” in *The Village Voice* who attacked FUNY for supposedly excluding individuals with other points of view that FUNY said were really agent-provocateurs.]

The economist Shane Mage, who had gotten his PhD in economics at Columbia, gave a class at FUNY as well. Mage was a member of Tim Wohlforth’s American Committee for the Fourth International (ACFI) which LaRouche had been affiliated with as well and he may have even decided to follow Mage’s example.

[On Mage and other FUNY speakers, see <http://www.antigbook.com/boox/bibman/25388.shtml>.]

Despite PLP’s deserved reputation for 1930s style Marxism-Leninism, FUNY’s teachers included such New York New Left and counterculture luminaries as the Fugs Tuli Kupferberg, Stanley Aronowitz, James Weinstein, the anarchist poet Jackson MacLow, Paul Krassner, and Robert Anton Wilson among many others. In *The New York Left* was also further intellectually reenergized after the long years of McCarthyism with the launching of the Socialist Scholars Conferences around the same time.

FUNY’s surprising diversity of teachers stemmed from PL’s M-2-M attempt to attract a broad “New Left” audience and may have been inspired by Mao’s initial launching of the Cultural Revolution. PLP’s leadership eventually turned against Mao’s attack on leading Chinese CP leaders and reverted to its own peculiar brand of “worker”-oriented 1930s style “short hair” politics. The wing of PL committed to the M-2-M perspective bitterly broke with the leadership and embraced not just the Cultural Revolution but figures like Che Guevara as well. Some of them went on to become strong supporters of the National Office faction in SDS that later evolved into the Weathermen. It was this brief accident of history, so to speak, that gave LaRouche his first opportunity to teach his own particular brand of Marxist economics to a group of young radicals.

If you had met LaRouche at FUNY you would have encountered a tall man with a thick Karl Marx beard and a New England-Brahman accent. You would also quickly realize that his classes on Marx were nothing like anything traditionally offered before. Along with discussions of *Capital* and the writings of Rosa Luxemburg, LaRouche discussed the ideas of the “young Marx” and works like *The German Ideology* and Feuerbach’s *The Essence of Christianity* as well as books like Hegel’s *Phenomenology of Spirit*.

Yet what made LaRouche's presentations so compelling to many young New Left intellectuals is that he didn't just stop there. Instead, he attempted to incorporate works like Emile Durkheim's *Elementary Forms of the Religious Life* into a discussion about alienation or discussion of concepts like "negative entropy," the mathematical critique of Kurt Gödel against Bertrand Russell and the psychiatrist Lawrence Kubie's book *Neurotic Distortions of the Creative Process* as part of a course on Marxism. Having been inside the world of the Socialist Workers Party for some 15 years, LaRouche also had a grasp of the Marxist classics as well as a good knowledge of the history of both the American Left and the labor movement. Yet none of his ideas were simply limited to a "Trotskyist" interpretation of the world. Instead his ideas were very much in the spirit of the heady intellectual world of the New York New Left of the time, best exemplified by the phenomenal growth of the Socialist Scholars Conference (SSC).

Given the highly intellectual nature of his arguments, LaRouche's classes attracted some young radicals from Columbia and CUNY. As the "SDS Labor Committees" branched out to Philadelphia, he found new followers at Swarthmore and the University of Pennsylvania as well. LaRouche seems to have attracted a certain group of middle-level PLP members and other "red diaper babies" who were uncomfortable with the overtly countercultural positions represented by M-2-M but who also felt that PL's return to Stalinist-style "orthodoxy" was intellectually and spiritually deadening as well. This self-selected core group instinctively felt that LaRouche's new conceptualization of Marxism was far superior to the "diomat" versions promoted by the old sects or the amorphous ever-alienated "young Marx" so beloved by a certain strata of the New Left in part because of his ability to make his ideas credible and in part because they were themselves desperately seeking a path to Marxism that avoided the extremes of both recycled 1930s radicalism on the one hand and the excesses of the New Left counterculture on the other, a worldview that wrote off the white working class in particular.

In their view, LaRouche managed to combine a serious Marxist economic analysis that challenged the notion that capitalism has forever escaped major economic crisis by welfare-state Keynesian measures with a deeper view of society and culture that drew on people like Eric Fromm and others but didn't limit Marx to being just a "humanist" but also stressed Marx as revolutionary.

At the same time, LaRouche – like PL and to a degree like the wave of American Maoism that would bloom in the late 1960s – also rejected the rock drug counterculture symbolized by the Yippies, Herbert Marcuse, and the Weatherman in their own way. Yet behind all this there was also a fundamental belief that the Labor Committee took ideas "seriously." And LaRouche had some dazzling ideas indeed. In essence LaRouche was a unique merger of Old Left and New Left ideas.

In his famous "Letter to the New Left" published in the September-October 1960 issue of *New Left Review*, C. Wright Mills called for the abandonment of the "labor metaphysic" which he labeled a hangover from "Victorian Marxism." Naturally such an idea was anathema to "Old Left" sects such as the SWP, CPUSA, and PLP and the smaller Marxist sects such as the Workers League or Spartacist League.

LaRouche too was very much committed to the “labor metaphysic” in the ostensibly “Old Left” sense. However what made him so different in his appeal was that he viewed the working class far less from the cultural and ideological prism of the 1930s and far more from the view of the 1840s and Marx’s original notion of why the working class was so important in terms of social reproduction of society as a whole and not because workers per se had some organic unique quality. In fact it was just this view that alienated many on the Left who viewed the Labor Committee as “elitist” just as the overwhelming majority of members of the SWP didn’t “get” LaRouche either. However it was just this view that, curiously enough, made LaRouche such a “New Left” figure because he tried to reinterpret Marxism precisely from the prism created by cybernetics. He even tried to “read Marx” from the standpoint not of the first industrial revolution but from the second one promised by cybernetics. And in the ultimate irony, he was following a path first seriously traveled in the post-Stalinist Soviet Union even if it had no impact at all on the culture of the American CPUSA which remained steeped in the images of the old “class struggle” paradigm from the 1930s.

#### *Notes on CIPA*

The Committee for Independent Political Action (CIPA) was an anti-war group active in New York City. It was created to run James Weinstein (from *Studies on the Left*) as a candidate for the 19th Congressional District that included the West Side. Weinstein had recently completed a major study on the history of the old American Socialist Party and he wanted to encourage the SP model in SDS. (CIPA also published a highly-regarded journal called 19, which came out for only five issues and ended after the election.)

West Side CIPA was itself a branch of national CIPA, which seems to have held its first major nationwide conference in Chicago on 15 January 1966. Dick Gregory gave the keynote address. Ironically, future LaRouche-VP Candidate, the late James Bevel (then staff director of the SCLC’s Chicago Project-Community Organization) also played a prominent role. CIPA proposed to run independent candidates in both heavily Republican and heavily Democratic districts as a third voice.

As for National CIPA, it was composed of leading members from groups like Voters of Illinois (allied to the ADA); SDS, AFSC, Women for Peace, SNCC, and the SCLC along with independent radicals as well as members or former members of the CPUSA. (CIPA later merged into the National Conference for New Politics that helped ignite the Eugene McCarthy Campaign against Lyndon Johnson in 1968.)

In *Conceptual History*, Marcus/LaRouche describes his ties to CIPA this way:

Marcus' main tactical problem during the early Summer of 1966 was selecting some organizational framework within which selected graduates of his course could be held together and developed as a working group. His immediate objective was to move in on the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) . . . . At that moment, the largest visible

concentration of such candidates was being drawn by default toward the Progressive Labor Party (PLP) . . . . The raid on PLP was Marcus' immediate target, but it would not be possible to go after that objective directly. What was needed was some small fixed organizational base from which to launch and coordinate maneuvers into SDS and PLP ranks. The instrument for this was unintentionally provided by a pair of ambiguous characters, James Weinstein and Stanley Aronowitz, both of whom have undoubtedly cursed the day during years since.

Weinstein was the fund-raiser and therefore the virtual controller of a group that had taken over \*Studies on the Left, and was linked to a layer of ex-Communists deeply buried within the New York City Manhattan West Side reform Democratic Party organization. Aronowitz was an Alinsky-school community organizer working his way out of the Oil, Atomic and Chemical Workers union toward a career in OEO-type counterinsurgency projects. These two had met as a result of Aronowitz's appointed leadership position in national SDS and association with \*Studies on the Left.

Appealing to Weinstein's fascination with the pre-World War I Socialist Party of America, \*Aronowitz had used Weinstein's fund-raising resources and West Side connections to instigate the establishment of an organization styled as the Committee for Independent Political Action (CIPA). Aronowitz's ambitions for this project caused him to offer Marcus and his sole collaborator of that time [Carol] a "franchise" for lower West Side Manhattan.

. . . [N]either Marcus nor Aronowitz wished to be a captive of the other's immediate organization. However, a broader base was urgently needed for Weinstein's Independent Socialist congressional campaign, and Weinstein was almost fanatical about building a broad organization on the basis of a diversified federation of right to left socialists like the old SP. Marcus and his collaborator wanted an organizational framework through which to establish . . . a "foot in the door," for launching a movement on the basis of a Marxian program of expanded reproduction, and with a convenient proximity to SDS for the immediate future phases of this work. Thus was established the West Village-Chelsea Committee for Independent Political Action, generally more conveniently identified as "Lower West Side CIPA" or "West Village CIPA."

As for Aronowitz, he later recalled that in 1966-68, he had:

built three committees for independent political action in the district--upper west side, village and lower east side, we ran a campaign on an independent line in 1966 against [Leonard] Farbstein and softened him up for Bella because we raised the issues she laid out two years later. We got more than 4% of the vote in a one-party district and Farbstein was a product of the machine, a standard hack liberal.

The 19th Congressional District included the West Village. It was taken over by "Lyn Marcus" who actually published *Third Stage of Imperialism* under a "West Village CIPA" banner.

### *From West Village CIPA to Columbia*

LaRouche created his own West Village CIPA with recruits from his course on Marxist economics held at the Free University in 1966-67 after LaRouche left the SWP. The first CIPA document was entitled *A Second Front Against the Vietnam War*. CIPA as a city organization collapsed by 1967 but the West Side Tenants Union was created in the summer of 1967 with Ed Spannus and Bob Dillon (Columbia students who attended LaRouche's class on Marxism) playing a role. The West Side Tenants Union influenced two key Progressive Labor Party cadre Steve Fraser and Tony Papert (soon to be a leader of the 1968 Columbia strike) who co-wrote an internal PLP document entitled *Economism or Socialism?*

The PLP faction at Columbia was also influenced by a LaRouche supported proposal discussed at an SDS conference at Princeton (which took place in February 1967) which was aimed at protesting the hike in fares on the NY subway system. The SDS Transit Project further linked up the West Village CIPA members who attended the Free University with the PLP faction around Fraser and Papert along with independent SDS members.

At an SDS regional held at NYU on 10-11 February 1968, Leif Johnson and Steve Komm steered a discussion on organizing a possible upcoming Transit Strike in New York City in protest against a proposed fare hike. That same conference featured a panel on women's liberation led by, among others, Bernadine Dohrn. (It also marked the entry of the notorious Lower East Side's Up Against the Wall Motherfu\*kers/Black Mask into an SDS conference when they proposed a march to Lincoln Center carrying garbage which they wanted to drop on Lincoln Center plaza.)


Meanwhile, PLP sent Steve Fraser to Philadelphia where Fraser managed to recruit a section of the strong PLP faction at Swarthmore College (in particular) to what would eventually become the SDS Labor Committees. In May 1968, Fraser was expelled from PLP. PLP leader Milt Rosen then removed Fraser's cohort Tony Papert from PLP in June 1968. By that time, Papert had established a reputation as a leader at Columbia. LaRouche then began teaching his course on Marxist economics during the aftermath of the Columbia strike at yet another "Free School" at Columbia during the summer of 1968 where he consolidated a whole level of radicalized students who formed the New York branch of the ASDS Labor Committees.

(For a detailed description of that summer at Columbia that includes a glimpse of LaRouche – even though neither is identified by name – see James Simon Kunen, *The Strawberry Statement*, 137. Here LaRouche is described as "a very erudite and aged-looking fellow with a beard and everything." Kunen also includes discussions with Tony Papert and he sees the Labor Committee as a leading faction in the Columbia Strike.)

### *Notes on the Socialist Scholars Conference (SSC):*

The first SSC was held at Columbia University in September 1965. Perhaps the most

famous SSC was the Second Annual Conference held at the Hotel Commodore in September 1966, in part because it featured a major address by Isaac Deutscher, the leading Polish Trotskyist who wrote a famous three volume biography on Trotsky. Deutscher, who had been living in England where he had moved just before World War II broke out, died of a heart attack in Rome the next year. The third SSC took place at the New York Hilton in September 1967 and had an estimated 2,000 participants in attendance. LaRouche almost certainly attended at least one of these conferences. Both the rise of the SSC and FUNY again underline the general ferment in the New York Left as young radicals searched for new ideologies. It was only during this extraordinary moment that LaRouche found it possible to launch the organization that became the NCLC.

Originally Posted by **socialistboomer** 

**HH:** *Does this sound about right?*

**sb:** *Pretty much.*

**HH:** *I've never seen Crisis although I did see one issue of its successor paper (was it also called Crisis?) from the SLC.*

**sb:** *Don't recall the name of the SLC paper, but I don't think it was Crisis. I'm almost certain that their magazine was Perspectives.*

**HH:** *As for the split, it officially was announced on 19 March 1971 in NS. Actually NS says "Fraser expelled from NCLC." But I believe it was a split and not a simple expulsion.*

**sb:** *In the formal sense, it was definitely an expulsion. As I remember it (and it's possible some of the details are incorrect), Anita G. (I believe later known as Anita G. nee G) found a mimeo stencil (or a mimeo copy) of an internal "Bavarian" factional document planning an imminent split -- a head tax on each member of the faction to fund a new organization was part of it. The NEC then ordered the expulsion, by name, of members of that faction.*

**HH:** *So while there was no formal split in 1970 the NCLC was in reality deeply split during 1970.*

**sb:** *Things really hardened during the course of that year. There were the "pre-factional" issues raised, beginning in 1969, by proto-Bavarians (their opposition to "agnosticism" in the LC; the 1969 conference report delivered by Steve and T. Papert). In 1970, Lyn and others formed the Positive Political Tendency (PPT) in response to the Bavarians. I do not recall the "Bavarians" ever formally declaring themselves a faction or tendency. Even after the formation of the PPT, it took time for a hard division to develop throughout the organization.*

**HH:** *To claim that there was no deep factional divisions in the organization until*



*sometime between 1 January and 19 March 1971 sounds "incongruent."*

***sb:** I agree. I have never heard anyone make such a claim.*

***HH:** In fact, I suspect the split would have happened even sooner except that the organization as a whole was locked into the Fraser-Borgmann defense committee and this made the entire imbroglio even more complicated.*

***sb:** I don't have a basis for forming an opinion on this matter. I do recall that the "Bavarian" document found by Anita G. mentioned that defense work in Boston was a "problem" (I think that was the word used) because PPTers were active in defense work. From my perspective, the "Bavarians" wanted to exclude PPTers from FBDC activity -- not primarily due to differences over defense work, but because of a desire to have a theatre for factional activities, meetings, etc.*

***sb** on other comments of HH -- I thought an earlier posting of mine specified that I had posted material concerning my SDS LC and NCLC experience on this board and that private responders also believed that I had done so.*

*Additionally, I never claimed to have any blinding insights. But there are posters who have written that certain factual matters were "always" that way (e.g., automobiles). They weren't, as I have posted to the board. On matters that relate to Larouche's intent, there are posters who believe, for example, that it was "always" all about the money or that the whole thing was designed to fail from the start. Perhaps they are right. There are a lot of "always"es mentioned on Larouche Factnet. Well, from my standpoint, some of them weren't "always."*

## **HYLOZOIC HEDGEHOG REPLY TO SOCIALIST BOOMER**

Much thanks. (I'm guessing the Anita G was Anita from Bryn Mawr if I am thinking of the same person?) I had no knowledge at all about her role in finding the document or what triggered what now clearly was an expulsion as opposed to a formal split based on what you have said.

Also the comments on what happened at Chicago SDS in 1969 was great as well. I screwed that one up because I remember someone telling me something about Komm and somehow I associated his name with "Lets go Mets!" when this was clearly wrong. However, with FactNet we can fix these mistakes pretty painlessly.

When I get around to it, I will try to post some classics (including Bernadine Dohrn's attack on the "Marcusites" from *New Left Notes*). It just takes time to retype the originals.

## **LAROUCHETRUTH FACTNET POST**



## There was lots to like from the late 1960s LaRouche

---

In light of the foregoing back and forth, I want to reiterate what I posted a couple of days ago, and that others have also stated, that what LaRouche presented to the generation that came of age in the height of the student upsurge of the late 1960s made more sense than what was being put forward by almost any one else, certainly that I was aware of, certainly more sense than what the CP, SWP, Wohlforth (Workers' League), Robertson (Spartacist League), PLP, BPP, SDS-to-become-Weatherpeople, other Maoist sects, "consciousness-raising" collectives, Eselen Institute, Reichian psychology, and on and on, stood for.

Let's restate the problem. The "problem" was a corrupt society engaged in a hideous war that was killing millions of Vietnamese and tens of thousands of American soldiers, a nation where the CIA and FBI were engaged in violating the Constitutional rights of its citizens, where police brutality against the Black Panthers and blacks in general was awful, where basic civil rights were still far from as secured as they are today, where the possibility of a police state was not a fantasy, etc., etc. And the student upsurge created a "spirit of the age" that I suspect is impossible to impart to anyone who didn't live through it. The sense of possibility in the air to create a new society was tangible, and for as long as student radicalism seemed to be ever increasing, it appeared legitimate to extrapolate that expansion to the point of some sort of victory.

And one can't forget how this political radicalism was inextricably intertwined with the counter-culture, the outgrowth of the Beat Generation of Kerouac et al., the rampant experimentation with all sorts of drugs, above all LSD, "free love," etc., etc. Many "political" activists were just as much involved in the counter-culture as they were in politics.

Which resulted in what I'll call an "organic anarchism," an almost nihilistic rejection of all authority, of government, of mores, and of parents. Look, the term "generation gap" only arose in the 1960s to discuss the very widespread alienation of teenagers (and young 20s) from their parents in what was believed to be unprecedented numbers, and in the degree of that alienation.

Then, on top of this environment, you had the dead hand of the Old Left, the CP, trying to stay relevant through front groups since to recruit in its own name this soon after the height of McCarthyism would be suicidal, the SWP, PLP (with an "Old Left" Maoist veneer). The problem with all of this is that none of the groups, or movements, including SDS, had an analysis of the U.S. and world situation that pointed the way to how to actually be effective, and to eventually win, whether evolutionarily or revolutionarily.

That's the niche that LaRouche filled, somehow. Look, despite his inability to complete his freshman year at college, LaRouche has considerable intellectual talents, and he somehow put together a highly coherent explanation of the world situation, in a way that pointed a way forward that made more sense than the competition. He had a pretty complete coverage of everything needed for a compelling explanation and roadmap. By

claiming to have solved the "falling rate of profit" issue, he had a "proof" that prosperity would have to end at some point, and at that point, the non-revolutionary masses, above all workers, would be open to being radicalized in short order. He posited that at that point, if there was not some coherent organization of revolutionaries, this radicalism would take a fascist direction, as it had in the 1930s in Germany and Italy. So, unlike, say, PLP, and other "base builders" who argued for joining the working class and "radicalizing" them by, what exactly, talking to them??--like that was ever going to work--LaRouche had a mechanism that made eminent sense to explain what would have to happen--and why it would necessarily happen--psychology to change workers into a mental state where they would be receptive to a radical change in their world outlook, from narrow, "class-in-itself" interests to mature, socially-responsible "class-for-itself" outlooks, where they would see what we all already saw, the common interests of every one, workers, unemployed, blacks and other minorities, students, etc.

And then, rather than just some empty phrases about "socialism," LaRouche had concrete plans that never, as far as I can remember, went farther than a kind of Gaullist "dirigism," where he might posit Government ownership of certain utilities, but never any kind of Government ownership of all means of production, or any other such stupidities. He always posited a very limited socialism. His "Emergency Reconstruction Program" of the summer, 1971, was probably the high-water mark of relatively sane economic program.

And then add in the "erudition" factor, the heavy reliance on the works of the Early Marx, his supposed mastery of Hegel and Feuerbach as helping to understand Marx. And then Luxemburg, both her explanation of economics ("What Is Economics" is still a brilliant exposition), and her writings on the mass strike, which is a very real phenomenon (in fact, the student movement here and in Europe had much in common with a mass strike process), provided the notion of the mechanism whereby a radicalized working class would some day be capable of toppling bourgeois society. Throw in his seemingly encyclopedic understanding of the history of the modern left ("Centrism"), his references to psychology (Fromm, and Lawrence Kubie on the creative process), and this was a very rich brew.

So, as has often been remarked, LaRouche attracted precisely those students--those of us who joined pre-1973--who were not satisfied with the vague yearnings, planless assumptions about the future, who were not into pot and free love, who demanded an intellectually rigorous analysis of how one could get "from here to there," the "there" being socialism. There is nothing that I believe any of us need to be ashamed of in that period for joining the pre-1973 LC. About the worst that can be said was that there were others in "the movement" who distrusted on principle anyone who would claim to have it all figured out, whose judgment about LaRouche proved to be accurate, but these others were typically involved in groups that were really intellectually vacuous.

And given all the reinforcement that all of this provided, and the psychological grip that being part of a movement whose mission was to save the world provided us, it is not hard to understand how most of us succumbed to Lyn's onslaught on our identities in

1973, playing on our deepest insecurities, including sexual insecurities. And once each of us had bought into Mop-Up, the George brainwashing, the White brainwashing, and the Rockefeller conspiracy, the transformation of the organization itself seemed somehow "natural," an outgrowth of our necessary reaction to outside attacks on us. We had bought into LaRouche's paranoia, and, trapped from the inside, became paranoid ourselves, if not as severely.

As for those who joined post 1973, they will have to speak for themselves. They joined an organization that already didn't tolerate any internal dissent, which was demonstrably not the case pre-1973. I honestly do not know the hooks that operated then. I do think, in reality, that recruitment did slow dramatically post 1975, which I believe was the high-water mark for conference attendance--I remember that conference as being in a large auditorium at Columbia, and it was the conference where LaRouche told Eric Lerner that his problem was that he didn't know how to cry. Talk about projection!

Anyway, Hylozoic Hedgehog's explanation of when, why and how he left is very instructive, because I suspect something like that happened to most of us, there was an accumulation of "things," generally not a rejection of the "big picture," but specifics that cumulatively revealed Lyn to not be who he claimed to be, and to be someone increasingly perceived by us as unsavory, unstable, or whatever, to the point that we finally came to a point where the whole picture "snapped," and we were suddenly freed to picture a life outside the LC.

#### **FROM FACTNET MEMBER "HECKER" ON ORIGINS OF LC IN EUROPE**

Recently, the question was raised how the LC actually started in Europe. Since I was one of the first members (staying in the organization until the late 80ies), I thought I could provide you with my perspective on the beginning of the organization in Germany. However, since I didn't take any notes at the time, everything is from memory with the possibility of uncertainty....

**1969:** I moved from Frankfurt (where I had finished my pre-clinical studies) back to Duesseldorf which hosted a pretty small Medical Academy. Working as a tutor in an anatomy course, I met Uwe Friesecke and Anno Hellenbroich who were then active in a group called "IKM": Initiative Kritische Medizin. I joined this group (mainly Medical students) which held weekly meetings discussing mainly student and university policy issues such as: how to implement psychosomatic medicine and/or Medical Sociology into the regular curriculum etc. One member was Rainer Brenner who lived with his family in a dormitory where Ed Podhorn (who had come to Germany to avoid being drafted) and his wife Fren [Fran?] were his neighbors.

**1970:** The core group of the IKM decided to move together in order to intensify the political work; a house was found in the village Muenchrath and 11 people moved in: among them Hans Bandmann, Uwe F., Anno H., Rolf Pauls, Wolfgang Lillge (BTW the only one still being an active LC member, now located in Berlin), Hartmut Selle (a sociology student), and myself plus four others who never had anything to do with the

LC (two of them were members of the DKP).

**1971:** After the Podhorns had returned to the US, they contacted Uwe Henke (alias von Parpart) who was Fren's brother in law. Members in the Philadelphia area must help out here how it came about to expand the LC work to Europe! From the German end, I can only contribute, that Rainer Brenner one day received a postcard asking him to get in touch with some "comrades" in Cologne (the correct address missing...) He and Hans B. went to Cologne and really found the people they were supposed to meet: Gus, Nick and Yannis (American ex-members can probably describe how the connection of the LC to the Greek Epanastasi (?) came about!) Anyway, through this contact, lectures were set up, which later on were regularly given by Uwe vP and Webster Tarpley who both had moved to Germany and operated out of Hannover. I also remember that weekend seminars were held e.g. in the summer house of Uwe's mother near/or in Hameln (Dave Goldmann, Richard Shulman, Nick and his wife Barbara come to mind having participated in such meetings).

Through personal contacts i.e. school mates, relatives, friends etc., within a couple of weeks/months three study groups were established in Germany: Mainz/Frankfurt = with Michael and Gabriele Liebig, Matthias Mletzko and Gabriele's sister Lena, Harald Hermann, and I think pretty early on Carla Horn. Berlin= with Uwe F. and Anno H. (who had changed universities), Ortrun and Hartmut Cramer (who both were Medical students in Berlin), Wolfgang Lillge's brother Hans, and Helga (whom Uwe and Anno met in some kind of Marxist seminar). Through a quite fishy guy in Frankfurt (Peter Spengler) a contact was made to Americans Deserters Movement in Sweden: names that come to mind are Jones, Gaddy, Engdahl (I am not sure about Bill, though). Also in France, we had pretty soon contacts; Laurent Murawiec, Philip Golub, etc. – but I am not familiar with this end of the expansion of the organization...Other people might add this part of the story.

**1972:** In the summer, the first German delegation was invited to New York: Hans B., Hartmut S., Uwe F., Rolf P., Wolfgang L. and I. We were placed at different apartments: e.g. Hans B. stayed with Bob Dillon, Lillge and I stayed at Lyn's place in Morton Rd in the village while Lyn was in Europe (it took poor Shulman two days to clean up the place so that we could move in!!), and later on we were hosted by Leif and Sue Johnson near the Columbia University. I am very certain that Carol was in NYC in the summer of 1972 when Lyn returned from Europe, and I recollect very well that meeting at which Lyn publicly went after her...

Later in the year I moved out from Muenchrath and since I didn't belong to the selected core of future leaders, I was spared from Lyn's psycho sessions. I was still continuing my Medical studies and certainly was considered not to be 100 % political! (Only once I had passed the final exam, did I become a "full-timer" – in the Dortmund local).

**1973:** In early July the first ELC conference was held in a brewery in Duesseldorf without Lyn being there.

I attended the year end conference in NYC, witnessing the hysteric fits around the Chris

White “affair” which have been described in this forum. Actually, I was in the apartment where Alice Weitzman was held in custody (near the GW Bridge) and even was assigned to keep an eye on Bill E. after he freaked out at the conference.

**1974:** I attended one of the self-defense courses in the US (I don’t exactly recall the time, but it must have been early in the year). The course was led by one of the Torres brothers, and we were shown how to cut throats, how to use guns, long sticks, and numchucks (spelling?) I recall that Muriel Mirak and Webster Tarpley, both a couple at the time, participated as well.

In April 1974, we started publishing *New Solidarity* in German, and one of its first editions had the articles in which Willy Brandt was attacked for being a Nazi. In this campaign we put out the famous poster showing Brandt in a SS uniform. Since I functioned as the responsible person vis-à-vis the German press law, I was sued by the SPD, and eventually sentenced to a fine. In order to prepare for the different trials (which also included Anno H. and Volker Hassmann), I moved to Wiesbaden where I worked at headquarters from then on. (One funny anecdote: we persuaded Joseph Beuys, one of the leading contemporary artists to write an expertise that the poster was a piece of “art”!! which didn’t impress the judges though...)

In Summer and Autumn, I gave self defense courses in the area near Frankfurt (however without weapons...) It was mentioned in this forum, that in Europe, the mop-up strategy was not an issue; we interrupted meetings of the youth organization of the SPD every week, but never ever used physical force. In the course of 1974, the whole self-defense stuff was stopped, and a security staff was established. Members of this staff entered local shooting clubs in order to legally get their hands on weapons. The inner course of the staff (to which I didn’t belong) received training courses in the US e.g. at Mitch Werbell’s farm. Roy Frankhouser showed up in Wiesbaden consulting in security issues. Around that time, I took shifts at Lyn’s place (Kaiser-Friedrich-Ring in Wiesbaden); and I remember very clearly having had massive doubts why we thought that a handful of amateurs could withstand any attack by professionals... But, apparently, the doubts were not strong enough to already leave the organization at that time.

## **ON THE FIRST MAJOR NCLC FACTION FIGHT**


### **30 Dec. 1970 Fraser Document**

---

Here's the Fraser document dated 12/30/1970 written for the NCLC National Conference and a major polemic reflecting the bitter factionalism that had begun in 1970 and reached a high point at the National Convention.

<http://laroucheplanet.info/pmwiki/pm...ry.Pantherism1>

Quote:

Originally Posted by **scrimscrawl** 

*I'm fine-tooth combing this in order to get our overall timeline maximally accurate. It would appear that during 1970 that Fraser was in increasing conflict with the LC, but still having to work with them, in some manner or other, in raising funds for his legal defense on the '69 charges. There must have been considerable gritting of teeth going on.*

There was. Even after the split, they continued at some level to cooperate on the defense committee. The case, BTW, was thrown out when the Government refused to provide the name of its informer (most likely the guy who planted the explosives if there ever were explosives to begin with).

That case also marked the LC's first attempt to court the BPP in a big way. Someone from the LC (I think either Leif J. or Tony P) flew to Oakland to try to work out some kind of coordination with the BPP on joint defense work against the police.

As for the split, LaRouche accused Fraser of wanting to tilt too much to liberals for his defense committee and claimed Fraser wanted to join some popular front movement. Fraser said that this was absurd but that the trend of the country was left and the LC should attack the Pop Front from the outside but in a way aimed at winning pop front types to the LC program. Here I should stress that he didn't mean hippies or Weathermen but Walter Reuther's UAW.

Fraser in turn accused the LaRouche faction of "Pantherism," the idea that the United States was veering towards fascism. Fraser claimed Nixon was weak and a Pop Front government was more likely than fascism.

I came around the LC right after the split and I only saw Steve speak once at a meeting around welfare rights where he spoke as a member of the SLC. You would really need someone who lived through the split to provide more details about how much the clash was personal and how much it was political and how much it was both.

At that time, BTW, the LC still had an internal journal where dissenting (in fact all) opinions could be published. It was modeled on a policy that the SWP had.

After the split, I got a hold of one issue of the SLC paper whose title for the life of me I can't remember just now. However I do remember the lead article. It was a strong critique of one section of *Third Stage of Imperialism*. In it LaRouche has the wacky idea that the Vietnam War was "really" fought by US imperialism to provide a Mekong Valley "rice bowl" for the projected development of an industrial working class in India by the "advanced" section of Capital led by the CFR. (This notion had long been attacked by Tim Wohlforth and others as wrong.) The lead article in the SLC paper took the Pentagon Papers story and said that it further disproved LaRouche's theory about Vietnam.

On a final note -- Strange as it sounds, the FIRST Labor Committee to get heavily into "Beyond Psych" politics was actually the SLC. Sometime before it fell apart, it got very


heavily into the ideas of Wilhelm Reich. Their turn is mentioned in a Nancy Spannaus article in a late 1972-early 1973 *Campaigner* article that is devoted to attacking Wilhelm Reich.

Finally on the time line -- The 19 March 1971 NS reported that Fraser and 50 of his followers left the LC just one month prior to his trial. He officially left on 28 February 1971. (In other words, not long after the year end National Conference.) He was said to be trying to open up talks with the CP and that he was "pro-Reuther." Also in April 1971, the FBI files that were stolen in Media, PA, reach the papers and they mention the LC. This fact certainly made the world aware of police infiltration of leftie groups. Then in the 20-24 1971 issue of NS, it is reported that the Judge dismissed the entire Fraser-Borgmann trial after the Philadelphia DA refused to reveal the name of his informant in spite of a direct order from the Judge.

---

*Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 03-01-2009 at 12:15 PM.*

Quote:

Originally Posted by **scrimscrawl** 

*Of course, SDS itself, from this point on, began to rattle itself apart in factional fighting and my guess is that the LC didn't gain much traction in being associated with PL. But I wonder if anyone here who may have been active that early can shed light on whether the additional LCs (besides NY and Philly) It was always a mystery to me where all these LCs in the "National Caucus" exactly came from. I'm just trying to clear up history here. Were the local LCs all SDS sub-groups to begin with?*

It's a difficult question to answer especially because there was no national paper till early 1970. *New Solidarity* also came into existence just as the faction led by Steve Fraser (the "Bavarians") left the Labor Committee. The only things we have are *Campaigners* and some internal documents. So a lot of this is collage.

But the key event in the history of the SDS Labor Committee and SDS post-Columbia was the NYC Teachers Strike that happened in the Fall of 1968. The LC supported the teacher's union and said that the Ford Foundation was funding the black nationalists to break the teachers union. The LC argued that instead of arguing for "community control" of a decrepit school system, the teachers and members of oppressed communities should fight for massive investment in education infrastructure. (Sound familiar?)

This policy was in part led by Carol who was a school teacher. It flew in the face of the New Left embrace of all things Third Worldist. If you read the first attack on the LC in 1971 I think by George Morris in the *Daily World*, he actually thinks Lyn Marcus must be tied to Albert Shanker (!). Clearly he assumed this based on the LC's almost unique position in the Left in backing the Teachers Union.

This same policy would later result in the NCLC becoming very active in the Newark Teachers Union fight against Baraka's attempt to introduce an entire Black



Nationalist/Ron Karenga US (United Slaves) make-over of the Newark School System. I should add that Baraka discusses this period in his memoirs and even he says he was nuts. For example he wanted to introduce polygamous marriage because it was African, etc. He almost accuses himself of being totally insane. Also recall that Baraka actually dropped Black Nationalism a la Karenga by 1973-74 and became a Maoist Third World type. I should add that he doesn't mention the NCLC at all in his memoirs, but they are quite interesting none the less. As for the Newark Teachers Union was itself a black-led union and they actually helped subsidize the NCLC pamphlet attacking Baraka by buying it in number.

Back to 1968

The LC policy enraged the proto-Weatherman faction at Columbia and the first example that I could find of violence involving the LC was when a group of proto-Weathermen forcefully disrupted an LC organized meeting in Harlem during the crisis to discuss "expanded reproduction" as a way of addressing the NYC Strike. I think it is with this in mind that you have to read LaRouche and Carol's "*The New Left, Local Control, and Fascism*" document.

Somewhat remarkably in 1969, Ted Gold (who would soon die in the Townhouse Explosion) co-wrote an article for *Leviathan*, a key New York radical journal at the time, on the question of local control. He and his friends had clearly been stung by LC criticisms because the article includes references to the Ford Foundation and how the big bourgeoisie wanted to manipulate local control efforts along counter-insurgency lines. But in the fall of 1968, Gold totally supported Rodney McCoy.

As a result of the LC policy critically supporting the AFT, NY SDS moved to "expel" the LC from SDS for being horrible racists of the worst possible type. Curiously, according to an article in the *Campaigner*, it was ACTUALLY PL and NOT the proto-Weatherman faction around Rudd and Ted Gold, etc. who pushed for the expulsion.

It seems clear that PL did so in order to neutralize LC raids on PL cadre. PL also ran a big attack on "Lyn Marcus" by Rick Rhodes in *Challenge* as well. (This is the first time that the myth that "Lyn Marcus" really meant "Lenin & Marx.") So according the *Campaigner* PL was behind the attempted expulsion. I also believe (but haven't tracked down) an article in *New Left Notes* announcing that the LC had been kicked out of SDS for supporting the Teachers Strike.

Naturally the LC didn't recognize any ban. The LC argued that NY SDS or what called itself NY SDS had no right to ban any organization. In fact, there was an SDS LC contingent at the famous Chicago 1969 convention. It was led by Steve Komm and became somewhat legendary because while PLP and the National Office/Weatherman were chanting slogans against each other, Komm led the LC delegation in a chant that went "Let's Go Mets!" (This was the year the Mets would win the World Series.)

Meanwhile the chickens came home to roost when PL expelled the Weathermen

expelled PL. So apparently everybody could expel everybody.

1969 was also critical because it was the same year that Steve Fraser and Richard Borgmann were arrested in Philadelphia by Frank Rizzo's police on a phony bomb charge. Although the Swarthmore/Uwe contingent gets a lot of play, the guy who first organized Philly was Steve Fraser. But by 1970, Fraser broke with LaRouche and a significant number of then long-time members left with Fraser. In theory this should have been a huge setback to the LC but I suspect that in the wake of the collapse of SDS the LC grew quite a bit. By early 1973 (excluding the Maoists), it sort of was the third largest left sect behind the SWP (the largest non-Maoist sect) and the CPUSA (smaller numbers but with deep roots and connections).

As for how the LC spread, I know that in New Jersey it recruited a collective from Rutgers called "All You Can Eat." The LC also developed an important presence in Baltimore thanks to, I believe, a guy named Bob Kaufman who was a former SWP member and a very activist type. The LC also recruited an art professor at Johns Hopkins. It also managed to recruit Alan Salisbury and Zeke Boyd, both of whom were members of the Baltimore chapter of the Black Panther Party. But someone with personal experience of Baltimore would know better.

The LC also somehow managed by the early 1970s to get established in Madison, Wisconsin, one of the key universities for the New Left, particularly the early New Left. A big student radical from U. of Wis. at Madison was the late Bob Cohen. I'm not sure if he was recruited while at U. of Wisconsin. He later went to Buffalo, I think as a university professor, but I could be wrong. But I think he was in the orbit of the early Piccone *Telos* orbit before becoming a full time LCer.

As for other places, recall that once people graduated from a college, they often went on to grad school. So I think the LC Ann Arbor group was founded by a guy from Swarthmore who had an anthropology scholarship for grad school at the U. of Michigan at Ann Arbor. So people who dispersed from NY and Philly set up small groups across the country and they now had *New Solidarity* to sell.

The big LC failure on the East Coast was Boston. I believe this is because PLP had a total lock on the Harvard Strike in 1969. The LC just didn't have enough time to get to Boston before PL became hegemonic. PL's control of various student strikes, Harvard in particular, was very important in PL's attempted takeover of SDS in the disastrous summer convention in 1969. As I understand it, PL never wanted to own SDS lock, stock, and barrel but it definitely wanted a controlling interest. Everybody else despised PL and so you had not just the Weatherman (RYM I) but the proto-Maoist RYM II not to mention the overwhelming number of SDS members who weren't affiliated to any group at all.

Hope this helps. But much of it is not documented and some of the most important people left with Fraser. You can't understand Philly without understanding that both Philly and Cornell were Fraser strongholds. I believe this was because the people who


were recruited into the LC were recruited by Fraser via his old PL connections and the fact that he was both very smart and a good speaker. They in turn formed the Socialist Labor Committee (SLC) but that went out of business sometime around 1972-73.

---

*Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 02-28-2009 at 04:07 PM.*

## On SDS

Quote:

Originally Posted by **socialistboomer** 

[b]

**Cde. Hedgehog:** *There had been obvious violence between the Weathermen and PL at Columbia.*

**sb:** *Not obvious to me. And I think I would have been aware of it. As to those at Columbia in 1968: the only person I remember whose politics and stance, at that time, warranted characterization as "proto-Weatherman", was JJ. But let's include all the Columbia people who became Weatherfolk in that category.*

*Please provide instances of violence between Weatherman (however broadly defined) and PL at Columbia.*

## Socialstboomer, boomersage and Editrix:

My bad.

It's my error for not making it clear that Sale is talking about FALL 1969 post-strike and post split. The October 8 action was the Day of Rage demo in Chicago and Rudd is trying to recruit for it. And I'm glad you asked your question because in Fall 1968 the Rudd types and PLP were united in trying to strip the LC of the title SDS.

Sale's book on SDS is considered to this day a classic. However to me he fails in some areas especially by not discussing the fall of Carl Ogelsby from power which Ogelsby discusses in his recent memoir *Ravens in the Storm* -- where he too sort of takes some liberties with narrative accuracy as well.

Also sorry but I didn't want to have to further quote Sale but he writes on the same page (601) of his book *SDS* as I wanted to get right to Rockwell but right before he discusses Rockwell he writes the above which in part led me to write what I wrote in the earlier post. But to avoid confusion, I'm again quoting from Sale (p. 601):

"And as the school year began [Fall 1969 -- HH], Weatherman continued its up-against-the-wallism. Weatherleaders, with Rudd the most visible, scoured the country trying to drum up support for the National Action by haranguing student audiences, engaging PLers and others who disagreed with them in bloody fist fights, coming on with macho

toughness.

Rudd's appearance at Columbia on September 15 was typical, involving skirmishes between regulars and PLers, two separate meetings with guards at the doors, and Rudd's usual pitch to the regulars about how they should all be in Chicago on October 8. Rudd in heavy boots, workshirt, leather jacket and cloth cap, gave off vibrations of restless energy during his speech, pacing back and forth at audience level in front of an unused podium, brandishing a chair leg he had used in the PL battle, yelling at students there for being soft and 'whimpy,' and bragging of how he was preparing for the revolution ("I've got myself a gun -- has everyone here got a gun? Anyone? No!? W-el-ll you'd better f-k get your *sh-t* together").

It was right after this "rap" that Paul Rockwell spoke.

Hope this helps clear things up.

I also heard from a former PLer that they had confrontations with the Weathermen both in New York and Boston if memory serves me correctly. For some reason I think of a fight in a library basement?

Also speaking of violence: I am almost certain that somewhere I came across an SDS Labor Committee leaflet reporting that proto-Weathermen types (I believe including Ted Gold) forcefully disrupted an SDS LC meeting in Harlem during the teacher's strike where the LC was proposing joint action to unite ghetto residents and union teachers to demand better schools, new buildings, etc.

I also read that SDS regional was totally enraged by the LC because when the LC came out in favor of the teachers union, Albert Shanker reported that even SDS was in favor of the union. This threw both the Columbia and later regional SDS into a tizzy because it implied that all of SDS backed the teachers when clearly only the LC did. Hence the desire to kick the LC out of SDS to stop it having the right to use its name.


Does this incident ring any bells?

Sooner or later, I'd love to input here Bernadine Dohrn's December 13, 1968 *New Left Notes* attack on the LC as well.

---

*Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 03-20-2009 at 10:38 AM.*

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Editrix**   
*I'm referring to the Oct. 1974 Campaigner, "The Conceptual History of the Labor Committees." On p. 15 (16 in the PDF counter), Lyn talks about "an unusually talented*

*Columbia University campus celebrity" who broke with the LC in Fall 1968 over our support of the anti-community-control teachers' strike. He accuses the guy of a failure of courage.*

*Could that have been Paul Rockwell? Anyone else remember the details of what happened? I know he was hanging around us after the Columbia strike, although I don't think he was ever really a member.*

Welcome aboard Editrix and fasten your seatbelt because FactNet sometimes can be a bumpy ride.

Here are two mentions of Paul Rockwell, both of which suggest you may be right. First from an article "Right Face, Left Face: The Columbia Strike" by Samuel Hays in *Political Science Quarterly*, 84 (2), June 1969. At one point Hays writes about the period of Columbia's Liberation School: "Here, for example, in the post-strike days, Paul Rockwell and Tony Papert argued for the position of the New York SDS Labor Committee against the 'new working class' tendency. Their development of a well-formulated position was one of the major New Left innovations in the summer of 1968. By the fall they had become a major source of opposition to the 'new working class' elements in Columbia SDS; they supported the Teachers Union and opposed community control in the teachers strike on the grounds of decentralization . . ."

The article also goes on to cite articles in *Columbia Spectator*, a Tony Papert article in *New Left Notes* from 18 December 1969, and a PL attack on the LC by one Larry Poleshuck called "Phony 'Labor Committee' Loses SDS Name" in the Dec. 1968 issue of *Challenge*.

Paul Rockwell also pops up in Kirkpatrick Sales book *SDS* on page 601. He writes that Mark Rudd was at Columbia at Columbia on 25 September 1968 when he was pushing a tough guy proto-Weatherman line. There had been obvious violence between the Weathermen and PL at Columbia. Anyway, Rudd gives a talk about what a tough guy he is and how PL members are wimps, etc. Then Sale writes:

"After some 15 or 20 minutes of this, Paul Rockwell, a short stocky non-Weatherman SDSer got out of his seat and moved toward the front of the room declaring that Rudd had had his turn and now he wanted to speak. Rudd took two menacing steps toward Rockwell, hulking over him, but Rockwell just barreled ahead, slammed Rudd against the podium, pushed Rudd's fists away, and turned to face the audience. Rudd's face was a picture of stunned fear, all his rhetoric having done nothing to overcome his ingrained middle-class unfamiliarity with, and anxiety about, violence, he stood there a moment, shrugged, and then slunk off to join his friends to one side. The macho mood was dissipated; no one seems to have joined the Weatherranks that night."

So by the LaRouche Law of Logic, it would make sense that in the 1974 nut years he would accuse Rockwell of being a coward.

I guess you could also e-mail Rudd if he is on the web. I think he teaches math in Arizona and is totally against what he did in the 1960s unlike phony types like Ayers. It might also sound outrageous but you could even e-mail Papert presumably and ask him some things about Columbia. If he answers he answers and if not, not. As for Rockwell, it is such a common name, not sure if you could locate him on the web.

## WAYBACK TO THE SWP

---

In 2005, a former SWP leader named Barry Sheppard published volume one of *The Party*, the first of a planned two-volume memoir of his days inside the SWP. The book, published by Resistance Books in Australia and distributed by Haymarket Books in the U.S., contains some very useful information about both LaR and the early days.

## JOINING THE SWP

Believe it or not, Sheppard was an MIT student in the mid-1950s and when he graduated he worked as a computer programmer. Sheppard also first met Peter Camejo, another MIT math wiz who would play a very public role in the SWP.

In his memoirs, Sheppard goes into some detail about *Labor Action*, Max Shachtman's Independent Socialist League and its youth group, the Young Socialist League (YSL – the group that Frankhouser would later join as “Roy Houser.”) Sheppard does not list George Larrabee's name in the index to his book but it seems quite possible he knew Larrabee, given that Larrabee lived in Boston before coming to New York. (Weston may have been associated with the pacifist A.J. Muste who after 1956 headed the American Forum for Socialist Education that attracted ex-CP supporters, members of the SWP and independent radicals and helped begin the regroupment of the American Left.)

As for the YSL, it was headed by Michael Harrington. After the ISL decided to liquidate itself into the Socialist Party=Social Democratic Federation, Harrington led the YSL majority into the SP youth group YPSL. Before the merger, YPSL had exactly TWELVE members nationwide. After the merger, Harrington brought in some 120 more. At the time, Barry Sheppard (a sophomore at MIT) first went with the Harrington-YPSL majority. He went to a YPSL convention in Michigan and attended a cadre school that included talks by Max Schachtman. But even within the YPSL, a faction formed that included Sy Landry (later with American International Socialists) and the folksinger Dave Van Ronk (who later did a fund-raiser concert for the very early LC) and a few others. They opposed the idea of liquidating YPSL/ISL totally into the Democratic Party.

The YSL minority of about 30 members that included Tim Wohlforth, Shane Mage, and James Robertson rejected the SP-SDF as too rightwing and they oriented towards Muste and regroupment. They eventually wound up inside the SWP/YSA. As for Sheppard, at first in Boston he wanted a student alliance between the proto-YSA and left YPSL people like himself but he eventually gave up this hope and joined the SWP in November 1959.

The Boston SWP chapter that Sheppard joined was headed up by none other than Larry Trainor, the same SWP worker who led the Boston Local in 1949 when LaRouche joined. At the time Sheppard signed up, there were exactly EIGHT SWP cadre active in Boston, all of them industrial workers and all pretty much dominated by Trainor. The SWP had fewer than 600 members in the USA in 1959 with most of them in either New York or Los Angeles. One of those members was “Lyn Marcus”/Lyndon LaRouche.

### **SHEPPARD, LAROCHE AND STORIES OF MINSKY?**

After graduating from MIT, Sheppard was eventually asked to relocate to New York to play a leading role in the newly formed YSA. He writes that LaRouche “was among the sectarians repelled by the party’s identification with the Cuban Revolution and Malcolm X.” What this means is that LaRouche had at least some sympathy to the Wohlforth critique of Cuba under Castro and wasn’t crazy about Black Nationalism either. Sheppard says LaRouche more or less admitted to him after Wohlforth left the SWP in 1964 that he had been a member of the Workers League (then the ICFI). Sheppard says that LaRouche was expelled from the SWP which would have happened in 1966. LaR says he quit. Both seem sort of right. Sheppard writes: “The expulsion seemed to be basically okay with him.”

Most interestingly Sheppard says that when he was in the process of relocating from Boston to New York in the summer of 1961, he “was billeted at LaRouche’s apartment, where he lived with his companion.” It is hard to know if by this he means Janice or Carol. Whatever the case, Sheppard continues:

“LaRouche told me he was a ‘time study’ person. If true it meant he was hired by capitalists to figure out how to speed up workers. I thought this was not an occupation that a socialist should be involved in. However during the next five years or so before he was expelled, he was never hired in that capacity. He was supported by the women who lived with him. . . . LaRouche’s so-called ‘socialism’ always struck me as technocratic and hyper-intellectual with no relationship at all to real workers’ struggles anywhere.”

But what is most striking is that around the time that Sheppard met LaRouche, LaRouche actually tried to become involved in consulting for computers. It is also striking that Sheppard graduated from MIT, a school LaRouche couldn’t get into but was his ideal. It is also highly interesting that Sheppard even took a class from Marvin Minsky, the AI wizard at MIT. (In the early 1960s, DOD/DARPA had virtually abandoned cybernetics for AI funding even as the Soviets were proclaiming cybernetics as the next advance in Marxism.) In his book, Sheppard attacks Minsky in words that I believe LaRouche would copy almost word for word. Given Sheppard’s background in both MIT and computers, his job as a computer programmer, and the fact that he knew LaRouche pretty well for at least four years, I suspect LaRouche simply lifted ideas and jargon from Sheppard. Sheppard for a time even held a job at a publication called *Computers and Automation*, which I’m sure LaRouche must have read.



Here are Sheppard's observations about Marvin Minsky quoted in full (fn on pages 26-27):

"During the spring semester of 1959 I took a course in Artificial Intelligence, taught by Marvin Minsky. It was an interesting course, and paralled another I took on the logical foundations of mathematics. [Obviously a course involving Godel, HH] But there was one aspect of this course that really bothered me – the assumption by Minsky and others, that humans are basically computers. More precisely, they say that we are a computer program run on the "meat computers" of our brains. [A view very similar to the 19th century German materialist tradition of Vogt, Moleschott, etc. – HH] This view has come to be known as "hard" artificial intelligence (AI).

"They were certain, back in 1959, that within a few years they would discover that program or even one superior to it. Once I attended a symposium held by Minsky and other top MIT mathematicians, to which students were invited as observers. They defended this hard AI view, and got around the question of human consciousness by denying its existence! Here were four highly conscious human beings, consciously trying to communicate with hundreds of presumably conscious students, and the content of what they were communicating was that there is no such thing as consciousness! They also implied that the only possible alternative to this view was religion.

At the time I read Lenin's *Materialism and Emperio-Criticism*, a philosophical work. One of Lenin's points was that yes, human consciousness and the human mind are rooted in the material brain, but we don't yet know how. It struck me as better to just say we don't know the connections between the brain and the human mind and consciousness than to deny that the latter exists.

It is possible to assert that consciousness and mind are part of material reality and spring from that reality, without claiming that spirit or mind exist apart from the body as most religions do, and without adopting Minsky's mechanical materialism and reductionism either. Thinking about these philosophical issues drew me closer to the dialectical materialism of Marx."

Since Minsky wasn't a major player in the Macy Foundation/Wiener World of postwar Boston when LaRouche was around, I believe he basically lifted information he got from Sheppard and recycled it both for his business ideas and for his own version of cyber-Marxism. It seems obvious to me that since Sheppard and LaRouche knew each other from at least the summer of 1961 till the time LaRouche left the SWP, they must have talked more than once about such matters and also about computers in general.

## **OPERATION MOP UP**

Sheppard only discusses LaRouche in the page or two he devotes to the SWP response to the LC attack on the CPUSA in the spring of 1973. He says the first attack

took place at Temple U. against the YWLL. (I thought the first attack took place in NYC when the LC attacked the CP bookstore then around Union Square.) He says the SWP immediately ran an editorial attacking the LC even as the Daily World attacked the LC as “Trotskyites.” Although Sheppard wasn’t personally at the 23 April 1973 NCLC attack at Columbia against Rasheed Storey (who was also on a podium with Chaitkin and Joanna Misnik who was speaking for the SWP candidate named Norman Oliver), his friend Larry Seigle was and Seigle gave him a description of the chaos. Sheppard describes the union of CP, SWP, YWLL and Columbia students who managed to stop the LC from getting to Storey. He says the SWP and YSA people in the audience outnumbered the CP members and that Storey thanked them personally for saving him. [Rasheed Storey, it should be recalled, was the same guy who broke Don Phau’s nose outside the CP’s Marxist Center in June 1972.]

After that meeting, the NCLC then decided to declare war on the SWP/YSA. On 5 May a Detroit forum sponsored by the SWP/YSA was attacked but a squad of marshals with baseball bats drove the attackers away. That same night, the IS, Workers League and Sparts “joined us in physically defending an SWP mayoral campaign meeting, and the NCLC didn’t attack. A number of groups, including members of the YWLL, agreed to defend a meeting scheduled for our vice presidential candidate, Andrew Pulley, on Detroit’s Wayne State University.”

Outnumbered, the NCLC switched tactics and tried to assault individual members of the SWP/YSA. “They jumped three members of the SWP from behind on a street in New York.” An SWP’er named Jesse Smith had an arm broken. But “The NCLC pulled back from their campaign following this incident.” For Sheppard, LaRouche “had become the leader of a new, small but dangerous fascist group.”

### **REICH, GAYS AND A SPLIT IN THE SWP?**

In 1972 *NS* ran a long article almost certainly by LaR predicting a major split in the SWP. The split never happened; nor does Sheppard reference the article in his memoir. However there was a potential split brewing over the question of the SWP’s position on gay rights. Sheppard reports that as far back as the spring of 1963 the SWP banned homosexuality and threw out two members, a gay male couple, caught necking at a party. The ostensible reason was that to be gay subjected you to FBI blackmail but the two were openly gay so the explanation didn’t make sense. Basically the SWP was culturally square.

Post Stonewall, this view became more and more difficult to justify as the YSA increased its youth recruiting. The party, however, was deeply divided as to how far it should be involved in any direct political participation in the gay movement. Basically the workerists and old-timers thought it would be a disaster. Sheppard says that Tom Kerry opposed any intense involvement in gay liberation and it seems highly likely that Larry Trainor, workerist par excellence, felt the same way. Sheppard was for more involvement and viewed it as a fertile recruiting ground for new members. Sheppard was also giving talks on the ideas of Wilhelm Reich as well in mid-1972. He says that

Farrell Dobbs actually supported his view of wanting more active involvement but says that Dobbs said it was impossible and would split the party. Therefore local branches weren't ordered to work actively with gay organizations and local gay struggles. At that time, both the CPUSA and all the Maoists believed homosexuality was a mental disease caused by capitalism.

As for the LC, it may be that the attack on Reich was in part directed as part of a larger polemic to appeal to the workerist factions in the party in the hope that it might split. LaRouche also says (I think in *the Power of Reason*) that he last visited Larry Trainor sometime in 1971 or 1972 and he may have been trying to get Trainor out of the SWP and into the LC in anticipation of a split. Sheppard, however, says he believes Dobbs' fear of a split developing was overrated and that the SWP made a mistake.

As for the time sequence: At a May 1971 plenum of the National Committee, a short resolution passed backing "unconditional support" for democratic rights for homosexuals. Gay and lesbian SWP/YSA members also began attending meetings of gay groups and reporting on what they found. Then at the August 1971 SWP convention, the NC position was ratified but because of resistance, all profiling of gay groups was ended. The SWP decided to open up a debate about the issue in the May 1972 plenum. The broader debate apparently took place at the August 1972 SWP educational conference held at Oberlin College but sometime in 1972 a compromise position was achieved. In December 1971, LaRouche wrote an article on the tension between the YSA and the SWP labor types and then in June 1972, LaRouche wrote a long *NS* article -- "Death of the SWP" -- predicting some kind of split. Of course, by June 1973 the LC was actively engaged not in recruiting individual SWP members but breaking their arms.

## THE WEISS NETWORK

Sheppard's book is written in the dull prose style of the *Militant* which he edited for years. His book never discusses things like FPFC in any detail and he never addresses the scope of the FBI penetration into the SWP which was remarkable. The SWP was a high-priority FBI target for COINTELPRO. One reason seems to be de-Stalinization which reached its heights under the late Nikita Khrushchev period before partial re-Stalinization under Brezhnev. I was astonished to learn that two YSA members were invited to attend the famous Summer 1962 Helsinki Youth Festival sponsored by the CP and were even permitted to spend a few weeks touring Russia afterward. (This also helps explain why someone like Oswald could pose with a picture of BOTH *the Daily Worker* and *Militant* in that famous photo of Lee and his rifle.)

Sheppard also writes a fair amount about the Weiss network in the SWP which he sees more as a personal clique with shady ties to James Cannon. As for dates, he says that Myra Tanner Weiss was the SWP V-P candidate with Dobbs in 1960 and not 1964. He also says Weiss left the SWP after the 1965 convention.

[As an aside: Sheppard has a long but interesting footnote on the question of the Bert

Cochran faction and the SWP in the early 1950s as well as Cannon's views and his attempt first to use Murry Weiss against Cochran. In this context, Sheppard writes that the Cochran group, which had its roots in the SWP's organizing in the UAW, by the early 1950s believed the SWP had been too optimistic about independent radicalism and they wanted "an orientation toward existing left milieus, including the Stalinists. They held that the party was exaggerating its prospects elsewhere. The Cochran group traced this failure to the optimistic projections that the party had made during the post-war labor upsurge of the 1940s, when the party had recruited many hundreds of workers across the country." Recall that this was also the same time [right on the cusp of McCarthyism] that the SWP first recruited LaRouche as well.]

Sheppard clearly doesn't like the Weiss network and he saw it as trying to undermine Dobbs' leadership in a sort of sneaky way. He also says that Larry Trainor was against Weiss and there was a view that Weiss ran a clique. As Sheppard writes, "The Weiss group acted like a set of friends who held themselves somewhat apart from the rest of the party. They supported each other in election for party posts and considered themselves a little superior politically and theoretically. . . . Dobbs and Kerry regarded the Weiss group as a clique, but were opposed to organizing a counter-grouping or acting in a vindictive fashion towards Murry and Myra or their supporters." Sheppard says that Weiss resigned from the SWP shortly after the 1965 convention in part because Weiss had suffered a very serious stroke and couldn't function at the same level as he had in the past.

Weiss also had served as a kind of protector of dissident groupings inside the SWP. For example, even though he didn't agree at all with James Robertson over Cuba, Weiss didn't want Robertson expelled. I imagine he also didn't want Wohlforth to quit either. Weiss seems to have wanted for whatever reason a fair amount of challenges to the established leadership, perhaps in part because he was maneuvering for power and maybe he had a broader view of ideology. I can't say. BUT once Weiss left, LaRouche's days as a dissident were even more numbered so it is not all that surprising that he left/was expelled in 1966. My sense is that he was trying to somehow find a few followers in the SWP with his long internal documents that were published by the party press and couldn't get any traction. The only group that would tolerate him was Wohlforth's ACFI which itself was a tiny grouping to begin with. Therefore LaRouche played a double role trying to get independent support while also trying to take over the ACFI. When he met Healy in Canada and Healy hated him, that gambit became impossible as well.

From that moment on, he decided to build his own "Fifth International" starting first with the courses at FUNY and then with West Village CIPA.

## Philadelphia Story

---

Thanks to **chator's** tip, I tracked down *The People of This Generation: The Rise and Fall of the New left in Philadelphia*, a book by Paul Lyons, published by the U of Penn.

Press in 2003.

It quite surprisingly features the LC in a fairly intelligent discussion in the last 30 pages. One of the people the author talked to for the book was Jane "Muffin" Friedman, who had been an SDS LC activist in Philly and remains to this day in Philadelphia as a leftie health care professional. (Although Lyons doesn't mention it, Jane Friedman was arrested in the Philadelphia apartment of Fraser and Borgmann during the "1969 bomb plot" raid. I assume she was one of the "Bavarians" who left with Fraser).

Here I will really only deal with a few LC topics but I have to say that Lyons overview of the state of the Philadelphia left ran very true to me. He points out that the Left in Philly was dominated by the elite campuses on the one hand and the Quaker-driven anti-war "Resistance" movement on the other. As someone who grew up in Philly, this is exactly how I remember it as well.

Unlike in New York City, there was no cultural CP Pop Front or old-school Trotskyist Left around in any meaningful way. Philadelphia radicalism to a surprising degree was dominated by the WASP/AFSC and SANE types -- although I'm sure the CP had people in groups like SANE and Women's International League for Peace, etc. Because the Left was either elite Quaker school college students (Lyons has an entire chapter on Swarthmore but he also examines the far weaker movements on the Catholic colleges as well) , the sense that one was living in a remarkable intellectual world -- a world not dominated by Marxist-Leninist Jargon but more in the earlier New Left "moral resistance" tradition -- went hand in hand with feelings of displacement and alienation as the working class was to a large degree in the hands of the Democratic machine and South Philly favorite son Frank Rizzo's police. Nor was there much of a counter-culture in Philadelphia, unlike New York and San Francisco.

I think this is one reason that the LC gained traction in Philly because many people felt the New Left was doomed unless you had some inroad into the working class and there was no real Weatherman-line attacking whites.

[I should add that Lyons covers the 1969 Black Student Association protests at Swarthmore in some detail as well but no mention of Dennis Speed. However Lyons main interest in Swarthmore is in its earlier role as a kind of Philadelphia area "hub" for SDS in the early to mid-1960s]

In a way, the relative "backwardness" of Philadelphia made the Left there a bit less crazy. Violent Black Panther rhetoric works less well there with AFSC check book writers. Also there were no real media stars or Yippie types. In a way, this made the Left there both more sober and more marginal. You couldn't live all that easily in a total "East Village" or "Upper West Side" bubble. Philadelphia simply lacked the kind of political history that made such things possible in both San Francisco and New York. Also the 50s purges against the CP really seems to have delivered a knock out blow that the Old Left never got over. Instead they mostly liquidated into whatever was the reform wing of the Democratic Party there or worked with the AFSC, which had

defended the CP during the 50s when the City wanted CP teachers to sign loyalty oaths or lose their job.

## **THE LC AND THE PENN STRIKE**

But to discuss all this is to go far beyond the purpose of this post which is the LC.

Lyons' main discussion of the LC comes on pages 210-216 and in the context of the Penn Strike and the important role the LC played as the radical left of the strike. (It seems either that there was no PLP presence at Penn or that Fraser had taken the PLP chapter more or less with him when he relocated in Philly as a student at Temple.)

Lyons writes of the LC:

“One of their key leaders Steve Fraser was a student at Temple University and sparked the growth of organizational support at both Swarthmore and Penn with a sharply ideological, pro-working-class analysis centering on what they called a ‘socialist reorganization’ of the economy. The Labor Committee argued in favor of confiscatory taxes on what they perceived as wasteful and parasitic investment. Their sense of certainly, the appearance they gave of being more scientific, that is, more legitimately Marxist-Leninist than their rivals, the specificity of both their analysis and their proposals made the organization attractive to some New Leftists floundering after the self-destruction of SDS and wary of the adventurism of the Weatherman and other factions. The Labor Committee was the most important sectarian force during the sit-in at the University of Pennsylvania.”

Lyons then goes into the Penn Strike and remarks that it could have turned into a second Columbia – given Rizzo's lust to deploy the cops -- and the reasons why it didn't. Those interested in his take of the events can read it in his book. To his credit, he also came across the Labor Committee history of the Penn Strike that he found in an archive of Philadelphia SANE in their papers about the Fraser-Borgmann Defense Committee. He also gives different sides versions of the Penn Strike.

## **THE "GREATBOMB PLOT" BEFORE THE "GREAT BOMB PLOT"!**

Most amazing for me was the news that there were actually two bomb plot charges against the LC! Lyons makes it clear that it was the LC's role during the Penn Strike that put it on Rizzo's hit list. We also know about the May 1969 arrest of Fraser and Borgmann. But I for one had no idea that Rizzo had been using his Red Squad to put out the claim that the LC was planning to blow up high schools as well!

From Lyons:

“In February 1969, the Philadelphia police arrested eight members of the Labor Committee for distributing leaflets about the UCSC protests [Penn's University City Science Center that was accused of shady real estate practices and driving out poor

people from their homes in order to expand -- HH] in front of two West Philadelphia public schools. Commissioner Rizzo justified the arrests by charging that evidence existed indicating that the Labor Committee was planning to blow up public schools, a ludicrous charge in light of the strikingly anti-adventurist public policy of this very small group.”

If I read the tea-leaves correctly, the police had their sights on the LC because they knew it just missed having a major impact at Penn. Lyons says the LC also had developed some relationship with the Philadelphia branch of the Black Panther Party and this clearly worried the police as well. Lyons says that Penn's Society of African-American Students (SAAS) actually helped out the administration during the strike by representing a black organization that was opposed to the LC. (In his words: "In fact, SASS played a quiet role and helped fend off Labor Committee claims of black support." Basically SASS really wanted the establishment of a black studies program and wanted to get Penn go agree to such a program. Also recall that the Penn Strike happened AFTER the LC gave critical support to the NYC AFT against the black nationalists in the Fall 1968 famous teachers' strike.)

## PHILLY ZEITGEIST

Finally, Lyons writes about this period in general something I find remarkably perceptive not just because I think it captures perfectly the “vibe” of the New Left at least as I experienced it but also because it argues against what I consider “limited” attempts to explain the pre-1973 LC in terms of some magical power of Lyndon LaRouche to make others do his bidding, as I remarked in an earlier post.

In *The People of This Generation*, Lyons writes:

“The schizophrenic qualities of the late 1960s, among the New Left in Philadelphia and the nation at large, rests on the simultaneous euphoria of revolutionary expectations and the deep, abiding despair of feeling helpless, utterly ineffective, even facing the triumph of a home-grown fascism. [In fact to guard against this sense of coming apart, many people looked to vanguard-style sects especially after Nixon’s huge victory in 1972 – HH.] That New Leftists misread the political landscape is indisputable and tragic. That they had difficulty in understanding how their own confrontational style was playing into the hands of those like George Wallace, Richard Nixon, Ronald Reagan, and Frank Rizzo is perfectly clear. That they often mistook the extraordinary emergence of the youthful counterculture of hippies and freaks, rock n rollers and dopesters, underground papers and head shops, for a revolutionary movement was unfortunate. Without indulging in a ‘best of times, worst of times’ cliché, it is clear that there was an intensity of events and forces during the late 1960s that made it appear to be either both revolutionary and counter-revolutionary. The times were, indeed, intense, and millennial, especially to the young.

“As such, the times from 1967 until the end of the war were extraordinarily contradictory.”



To me the above goes right to the heart of the matter when it comes to understanding both the rise and fall of groups like the NCLC. It was indeed the period of *Zabriskie Point* and the George Wallace movement.

Most ironic of all: Not only was the New Left and a group like the LC confused about the future – so too were the cops. It was a brief moment in time when everything potentially seemed up for grabs. Or why else were the cops themselves so paranoid about the future that they had to accuse the LC not once but twice for imaginary bomb plots in the City of Brotherly Love?

---

*Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 05-22-2009 at 08:59 AM.*

## THE OLD MOLE FILES

### Opening the "Old Mole" Files

---

In a saga worthy of an old episode of "Mission Impossible," yours truly has been given limited access to what has been dubbed "the Old Mole Files." While it is impossible to know for certain how much of what will be related is accurate and how much is speculation, educated guess -- or just plain wrong -- I cannot say.

I also must report that as a condition for gaining even limited access, I have been instructed to use this forum to relay a mysterious message that I do not claim to understand.

The message reads: **"To the Plum Street Collective: Know that your secret is safe."**

Now from the files:

#### The Uwe Profile:

Uwe was born in 1939. He came from an old Junker family based in East Prussia in Konigsberg. His grand-parents were German nationalists but not at all attracted to the Nazis. Uwe's father, however, joined the Nazi Party in order to be able to go to university.

Uwe's father was drafted into the Waffen-SS as an officer. He fought on the Eastern Front as a member of the Das Reich Division. Then the file reads about his father: *"Shot by the Gestapo at Stalingrad for anti-Nazi agitation."*

In Germany, Uwe got an MA in philosophy and mathematics. He served in the German Navy as an intelligence officer. In 1961 he was assigned to NATO Headquarters then in

Paris. He later joined German SDS.

Uwe's commanding officer in Paris later became the head of MAD, West German military intelligence.

### **Fuss About Gus -- Opening the Old Mole Files**

---

the Old Mole Files includes two statements on Gus.

1) Gus was born in Greece in 1948. He hates the Communist Party because he believes he was betrayed by members of the Greek CP to the junta and just narrowly escaped. He was in the Greek underground from 1967-68.

2) Gus was born in Greece in March 1947. His father was a shoemaker. His father spoke little English. Gus came to America around 1962 and grew up in Jamaica, Queens. He later became involved with the CP youth group "Advance" in its Lower East Side chapter. He returned to Greece in 1966 to study at the University of Thessolonika. He later claimed that he had been arrested in Greece. He was always ready to go off and fight even in Venezuela. "Super intellectual." He spent 1965-66 in the Du Bois Club.

Gus and Nick worked for the American Committee for Democracy and Freedom in Greece from 1965-69. They created an ultra-left youth section known as "Resistance" which lasted from 1967-69. It was as leaders of Resistance that they first crossed paths with the NCLC. "Resistance" also attacked the Greek CP group "Democratia."

As for Nick, he was born in Greece in 1945. He came to the United States in 1959. A former member of the Greek CP.

### **the Old Mole Files: The East German Connection?**

---

In the 1970s, the Central Committee Secretariat (or Secretary of the Central Committee) with the approval of the SED CC authorized Jurgen Kuczinski to meet regularly with the NCLC. He first met the LC in the BRD and then later in the DDR.

Is the "Old Mole" claim correct?

It should be noted that Jurgen Kuczinski was a very famous economic historian who lived many years in England. He was also linked through family connections to Soviet espionage operations in the 1940s and 1950s including issues involved with nuclear espionage.

Unfortunately the Old Mole Files don't explain more what the relationship between Kuczinski and the ELC was or who allegedly met with him. Nor does it state whether or not Kuczinski was favorable to the group or not or how long the alleged connection lasted or any description of the conversations.

Again, we have limited information and this statement should be used more as a lead rather than a confirmation of any thing.

### **The Old Mole Files: In the Name of the Rose?**

Greg Rose, the mystery man who helped LaRouche "deprogram" Chris White, was born in Hamilton, Ohio. in September 1951. He went to the University of Cincinnati. where he first studied classics and then political science/history. He left the U of Cincinnati in June 1972.

Rose then entered Mount St. Mary Roman Catholic Seminary in Cincinnati. He left it in April 1973. Rose also took courses at Xavier University and Miami U. in Ohio. From June-Sept. 1973, he studied history and economics at Miami U. in Ohio.

Rose left Miami U. in October 1973 on instructions from the NCLC.

As a high school and college student, Rose was a member of Teenage Young Republicans and College Young Republicans. He was a member of YAF for a year when he was in high school. During high school, he spent six months at the Univ. of Durham in England thanks to a grant from the American Institute for Foreign Study, where he also worked on archeological digs.

Rose said he became radicalized in the seminary through Catholic Workers and Catholic anti-war demos.

In May 1973, Rose joined the NCLC.

May-October 1973 -- Rose worked in the Cincinnati local.

Sept. 1973 -- Rose came to NYC for a NU-WRO conference.

Here he meets LaRouche and Nick. Rose said he was asked to stay by them because he said he could read Russian. Syvriotis make Rose head of the "Worker States File."

From October 1973 to January 1974, Rose headed the File and also became part of the "International Secretariat."

In January 1974, he becomes "Assistant Director of International Intelligence."

March 1974 -- Rose becomes "Director of Counter-Intelligence" for Security!

August 1974 -- Rose goes to Wiesbaden for the August ELC Conference.

During this period, Rose earned some money as a "financial analyst" for Computron.

In January 1975, Rose was demoted from Security and made an assistant editor of *New*

### *Solidarity.*

In the late 1974, Internal Conference, Rose wanted to advance a United Front with the CPUSA and the Soviet Union but met opposition. Warren Hammerman also wanted to move the LC closer to the Soviet Union but he was defeated as well although Hammerman was too valuable to lose his NEC position.

In June 1975, Rose was charged with "violation of party discipline" but refused to recant.

Rose resigned from the NCLC on June 15, 1975.

### **ANALYSIS**

There is no mention of Rose's role as a voluntary FBI informant while still a member of the NCLC. Yet what is most amazing is the fact that someone with almost zero experience in the Left -- and who only joined the LC during Mop-Up in May 1973 -- somehow wound up in a top "Security" post inside the organization by the winter of 1973! This was true even though there were other members of the NCLC who could speak and read Russian.

How was it possible that Rose gained such a position so quickly?

Alas, the Old Mole Files are silent on this matter.

---

*Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 06-03-2009 at 06:06 PM.*

Quote:

Originally Posted by **borismaglev** [▶](#)

*A full 70% of the datapoints of what you have posted of the Old Mole Files are fabrications. About the Plum Street Collective, I am dubious. I will not tell you which 30% is true because I would be divulging more than I am willing at this time.*

Let's be careful. There are "fabrications" which are deliberate lies and then there are mistakes or misunderstandings, different points of view, failed memories, etc. Remember we are dealing with murky subjects. Remember that among the top LC cadre few people had any idea of LaRouche's fundamentalist Quaker background, for example. Naturally information is going to be hazy. For 99% of the non-Greek members of the organization, the Greeks were a total mystery as well. They just sort of showed up and sort of replaced the old NEC from the SDS years. Sort of out of nowhere, Gus became LaRouche's major domo.

However I have heard of some of the things said about both Uwe and Rose well before today. With Gus, I don't know. Anyway, it is useful to get the stuff out in the open

because it might provoke more accurate recollections and clear up misconceptions.

As far as "G D Krasni" goes: I did remember somewhere in the back of my mind that Rose had something to do with the priesthood, etc. and now I see this. But for the exact dates of Rose's relationship to the NCLC, I have no idea. I just remember this frog like figure showing up in New York some time in the fall of 1973. My first real memory of him, actually as a significant figure, was during the Chris White Affair. I remember him being able to pronounce the KBG's full name in Russian during a speech in the midst of the Chris White Affair.

With Uwe, I remember hearing myself that he had something to do with NATO in Paris before De Gaulle pulled France out. I also remember hearing the story of Uwe as a child walking from East to West. However, the story of his father was new to me. I knew he had been killed but didn't know the details. Is this a fabrication?

As for Gus: Surely Gus had some involvement with the CP in New York and Greece even if the details are wrong. And if he hated the CP -- after all he was the key guy who made Mop-Up happen along with LaRouche -- his hatred of the CP might well be rooted in events that took place in his past, yes? His confrontation with the CP clearly had some kind of emotional basis that in part must have gone back to his father but must also have involved him as well. Gus made Mop-Up happen big time. There had to be some emotional sense of payback in it for him. I mean he planned it with LaRouche. Maybe he even introduced the idea to LaRouche in the first place for all I know.

As for the "Plum Street Collective" reference: Who knows what it means . . .

---

*Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 06-03-2009 at 07:22 PM.*

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Hylozoic Hedgehog** 

*Let's be careful. There are "fabrications" which are deliberate lies and then there are mistakes or misunderstandings, different points of view. failed memories, etc.*

This is a fabrication and there is reason to believe that the Urquelle is Greg Rose himself. The part about him is too self-serving. Rachel Berthoff (now Douglas) had ascertained that he didn't know Russian and passed it on to Jose Torres and then to Lyn early in January 1974. The various titles mentioned in your posting are titles that Rose conferred on himself when talking to members. Neither LaRouche nor the NEC gave him any titles that were confirmed at any NC meeting or any National Conference. Uwe and Jose Torres were running Intelligence and Security those days and neither of them gave Rose the light of day. He did not resign from the LC -- he was caught stealing, literally picking pockets, and he ran away to avoid the consequences. There were bets in the national office whether Rose was a greater thief or a greater liar. He managed for a brief time to promote himself claiming special privileges with Lyn. But when things calmed down after the January 1974 events and Lyn showed up at the National Office, Greg Rose disappeared.


Another reason I believe Greg Rose may be the Urquelle of your postings is the stuff about Gus, Nick and Uwe. They sound too much like what Greg Rose believed about them and are not entirely accurate. E.g., Gus was born and raised in the US and had no special hatred of the CP any more than any other LC red diaper baby who participated in Mop Up. Gus was totally mesmerized by LaRouche and his ferocity during Mop Up was meant to make LaRouche happy, not to work out any particular "hatred of the CP." Nick was never a member of the Greek CP -- he got close to CPUSA circles by way of being taken in and helped by Gus' family which was CPUSA/Greek Section. Uwe's father was a career officer of the German General Staff, not a Waffen SS draftee. He was sent to the Eastern Front for his anti-Hitler views, but was not "executed by the Gestapo in Stalingrad." He was killed in action, as the people who had transferred him to the Eastern Front had hoped and expected. These were facts known to older/original LC cadre/members in New York -- at least they became known as soon as the Greeks and Uwe joined (1971-1972). The info you posted were the impressions that Greg Rose might have got in late 73 - early 74, i.e., without the benefit of pre-1973 common knowledge among cadre-level NYC member. So what you have been given has two characteristics that stand out: (1) It puffs up and dignifies Greg Rose and (2) is full of bull\*\*\*\* about Uwe, Gus and Nick, mixed with tidbits of accurate and inaccurate gossip about them that was trickling down from the senior LC cadre to the revolving-door transient membership.

---

*Last edited by borismaglev; 06-03-2009 at 09:32 PM.*

**[I should add here for LaRouche Planet readers that all of this information came from an archive from a CPUSA dossier. The CPUSA interviewed Rose in detail and at one point Rose requested membership in the CPUSA. The CP also had its own sources on Gus Axios from people who knew him in New York. Needless to say this is just one of the sources used for the Old Mole Files.-- HH]**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **borismaglev** 

*This is a fabrication and there is reason to believe that the Urquelle is Greg Rose himself. The part about him is too self-serving. Rachel Berthoff (now Douglas) had ascertained that he didn't know Russian and passed it on to Jose Torres and then to Lyn early in January 1974. The various titles mentioned in your posting are titles that Rose conferred on himself when talking to members. Neither LaRouche nor the NEC gave him any titles that were confirmed at any NC meeting or any National Conference. Uwe and Jose Torres were running Intelligence and Security those days and neither of them gave Rose the light of day. He did not resign from the LC -- he was caught stealing, literally picking pockets, and he ran away to avoid the consequences. There were bets in the national office whether Rose was a greater thief or a greater liar. He managed for a brief time to promote himself claiming special privileges with Lyn. But when things calmed down after the January 1974 events and Lyn showed up at the National Office, Greg Rose disappeared. Another reason I believe Greg Rose may be*



*the Urquelle of your postings is the stuff about Gus, Nick and Uwe. They sound too much like what Greg Rose believed about them and are not entirely accurate. E.g., Gus was born and raised in the US and had no special hatred of the CP any more than any other LC red diaper baby who participated in Mop Up. Gus was totally mesmerized by LaRouche and his ferocity during Mop Up was meant to make LaRouche happy, not to work out any particular "hatred of the CP." Nick was never a member of the Greek CP -- he got close to CPUSA circles by way of being taken in and helped by Gus' family which was CPUSA/Greek Section. Uwe's father was a career officer of the German General Staff, not a Waffen SS draftee. He was sent to the Eastern Front for his anti-Hitler views, but was not "executed by the Gestapo in Stalingrad." He was killed in action, as the people who had transferred him to the Eastern Front had hoped and expected. These were facts known to older/original LC cadre/members in New York -- at least they became known as soon as the Greeks and Uwe joined (1971-1972). The info you posted were the impressions that Greg Rose might have got in late 73 - early 74, i.e., without the benefit of pre-1973 common knowledge among cadre-level NYC member. So what you have been given has two characteristics that stand out: (1) It puffs up and dignifies Greg Rose and (2) is full of bull\*\*\*\* about Uwe, Gus and Nick, mixed with tidbits of accurate and inaccurate gossip about them that was trickling down from the senior LC cadre to the revolving-door transient membership.*

Boris,

I am SURE you are right on this but hang on and there is more that has nothing to do with Rose. This is only the first post. BUT someone invited him to NYC and he did head up the Workers File stuff. He wrote long things in NS. HE also did have some leading role in Security. I still remember him coordinating a deployment to put Nat Hentoff under LC surveillance. This was sometime in the spring of 1974.

And I think he did read a little Russian. Otherwise he would have fooled everyone. BUT he didn't speak ANY Russian beyond the most primitive level. This is what Rachel told me as well. AND she said she told Security this as well **during** the Chris White "deprogramming" that was done with the TWO key figures being LaRouche and Greg Rose. Read the chapters about it on LaRouche Planet. Rose even determined White spoke Russian "with a Ukrainian accent."

LaRouche was also outraged at Rose for YEARS and would regularly attack him. I think it is because Rose was in Security at a pretty high level. I don't know if he also went to Wiesbaden in August 1974? Do you? Also remember Rose was the key source for Gus meeting with the Russians in 1974. He also exposed the link to Ken Duggan in *National Review*. He knew a lot of stuff.

Also you are not right about Rose being the only source about Gus. I'm sure he was one but not the only one. And as you will see later, some of the "Old Mole" stuff goes way back to 1968, when Rose was a non-factor. As for Uwe's dad being sent to the Eastern Front and executed by the Gestapo for anti-Nazi activities or sent to the Eastern Front to die in action because of his anti-Nazi views, to me that is an understandable error

and not self-serving of anything that I can see. Anyway it doesn't contradict the idea that the father joined the Nazi Party to go to school. It merely adds to it. I don't know if it is an invention or not. And is he right about the Das Reich division? Did the father die at Stalingrad? Etc.

As far as I can tell, Rose did work for Security until he went to *New Solidarity*. The most interesting thing of all is that at some point he also decided to become an FBI walk-in informant while he was still inside the LC. I also don't put it past him to have been a plant of some sort from the very beginning.

Anyway what I find most useful is the Greg Rose time line. But surely he didn't know about Gus being in Advance or the Du Bois Clubs etc.? And if he did think Gus got screwed by the CP in Greece, how is that self-serving of Greg Rose? I know there has to be more to the Gus story because his family was CP. I gather there was a CP Greek exile circle in the New York area as well.

We are just at the overture. The man with the missing hand is even more bizarre, trust me. Who was stabbed in California? Etc.

Also my job isn't to play lawyer for the Old Mole Files but to present them and get feedback which I appreciate. But it ain't all Greg Rose, I promise you and not everything Rose said was made up.

### **Elijah's Going: Zeke Boyd and the BPP -- The "Old Mole Files" Go Black to Basics**

---

In the summer of 1970, Zeke Boyd – already a member of the LC – wrote a long missive to the BPP HQ in Oakland complaining that the Baltimore BPP was lying about his past. The major lie they were telling was that he had been “expelled” from the BPP. In reality: “I QUIT THE PARTY.” The guy most behind the attack on Boyd was the new Defense Captain of the Baltimore BPP, John Clark. However the history of Boyd and the BPP dates back to an earlier Captain named Warren Hart.

Here now is Boyd's version of events.

#### **OUT OF THE ARMY**

On 7 December 1967, Elijah “Zeke” Boyd was officially discharged from the Army with the rank of staff sergeant. He joined the Army around 1961 and his last assignment was Vietnam where he served in Company B of the 41st Signal Battalion (C.A.). Returning to the Baltimore area, he got a job as a data clerk in a bank. He was completely apolitical.

Following MLK's death, there was a riot in Baltimore. The liberal city fathers created “One City Indivisible” and Zeke attended his first political meeting. (It was here he first ran across longtime Baltimore socialist gadfly and soon-to-be LC member Bob Kaufmann.) Zeke then got a job as a youth organizer with the Community Action



Agency in Turner Station, Maryland.

### **FIRST ENCOUNTERS WITH BPP**

At Turner Station, Zeke decided to bring some BPP members to meet the kids. Alas, he picked a group that he thought were the Panthers but turned out to be an organization of black cultural nationalists called The Society of Unified Liberation (SOUL) led by Xugunna Lumumba. They were not real Black Panthers, just over the top cultural nationalists.

Zeke was unimpressed.

Zeke then moved to Baltimore. He joined forces the Anti-Imperialist Movement (AIM), a Maoist-oriented group founded by Mike McKain. Zeke went to Montreal to take part in the “Hemispheric Conference to End the War in Vietnam.” Speakers from the NLF attended the conference which was sponsored by the Canadian CP. Bobby Seale also flew in to speak. At the conference, Zeke identified himself with the BPP. The NLF delegates gave them rings made of shot down US planes. They gave the women jewelry made from the same material.

Zeke asked Seale where he can find the Baltimore BPP. Seale told him to track down Warren Hart. Back in Baltimore, Zeke meets “Smitty,” a BPP “captain” who says he’s never heard of Hart. Finally Hart appears. It turns out he had been in Oakland. Finally after a couple of weeks of looking for him, Zeke and Hart connect. Hart is the historical founder of the Baltimore branch of the BPP.

### **COIN TOSS**

During a meeting, the BPP takes a vote for leadership: Zeke comes in first, Hart comes in second and Charles Smith (presumably “Smitty”?) winds up third. BUT the Panthers get a visit from New York led by Col. Joudan Ford, Ahmed Cetewayo [presumably Michael “Cetewayo” Tabor] and Dharuba [presumably Richard “Dharuba” Moore]. Ford tells them that the BPP doesn’t vote for leaders. Ford then decides who should be BPP leader “by flipping a coin.” Warren Hart wins the coin toss. Hart is now the new “Defense Captain.” They are all into Mao.

On Christmas Eve 1968 Boyd is arrested in some BPP –related incident in the bus terminal. (See the 17 February 1969 issue of the BPP paper.) Around the same time, supporters in Annapolis give the BPP \$1,500 IF they will just open a branch in Annapolis. But Hart takes the money and there is no Annapolis branch.

### **MEETING THE NCLC**

Zeke heard a local radio interview with members of the Philly LC who were visiting Baltimore. They talked about the bomb plot and how the black cultural nationalists had ruined the strike at the University of Pennsylvania. They discussed how they had

worked with the Philadelphia wing of the BPP against the nationalists to try to stop them from wrecking the Penn Strike.

Zeke was so impressed by what he heard that he organized a meeting for the SDS LC to speak at the Baltimore BPP HQ. About 60 people showed up. But while Zeke was out picking up people for the talk in a car, a “racist” BPP member (who was later expelled) freaked out at all the white people present and shut down the talk.

As for the BPP leader Hart, after he saw how interested Zeke had become in the LC, he got angry at him. Hart wants Boyd out of the BPP. Hart then goes to Oakland. When he returns, he says that anyone involved with PLP is a racist. [Presumably Hart thinks the LC is part of PLP/also recall the BPP in Chicago worked with the Weathermen in the 1969 convention against PL.] Hart tells Boyd either quite going to LC meetings or quit the BPP.

Boyd makes his decision: “I quit the BPP.” Boyd says he was not expelled. He quit. It is a lie to say he was expelled and Clark should stop lying.

Three weeks later Boyd’s trial takes place. There is no one from the BPP there to support him.

One month later, Zeke hears that Hart has been removed from power. He is replaced by a new Defense Captain named John Clark. Zeke isn’t impressed with him either. Clark also seems to think the LC and PLP are the same. As for Boyd, he is in no hurry to rejoin the BPP.

In October 1969, Boyd brings Bob Kaufman (A. Robert Kaufman, a long time Baltimore socialist activist and early LC member) to talk politics at the BPP HQ with Clark. They propose a united front with the BPP. The proposal [obviously based on the Philadelphia model] is totally rejected.

At the time the BPP was working with the “Mother Jones Collective” and they wanted to orient to recruiting “lumpen.” The LC is opposed to this approach. One Mary Mattsen (from the National Committee to Combat Fascism) wants Zeke out of any coalition work. Turns out she has been given the word from Clark. Zeke is even shut out from jointly writing a leaflet even though his participation had been agreed to beforehand.

To further attack Zeke, Clark puts out the lie that Boyd was expelled from the BPP when in reality Boyd quit after Hart gave him an ultimatum. Clark also complains that Boyd “brought that crazy white mother-f-cker [Bob Kaufman]” to the BPP HQ.

Then on 23 April 1970, the BPP office is raided by the Baltimore police. The LC joins in the organized defense of the BPP against the police attack.

## **ANALYSIS:**

The Old Mole Files have captured a very interesting glimpse at the local Baltimore BPP in its early days and much more besides as we shall see.

Clearly Boyd's letter to Oakland is part of a broader LC attempt to win Oakland HQ over to collaboration with the LC. Recall that around the same time, leading LC members are also flying to Oakland to meet with the Panther leadership over the "Philadelphia bomb plot" issue.

Boyd opens his letter to Oakland with the comment that he is complaining about Panther leader John Clark and his lies but he also points out that Clark had recently been "kidnapped." To understand both the specific reference and the history of the BPP in Baltimore, we examine Judson L. Jeffries, "Black Radicalism and Political Repression in Baltimore: the Case of the Black Panther Party" in *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 25, No. 1 (January 2002).

After King's assassination, Baltimore went through an incredible riot. Six people were killed, more than 700 hundred were injured and over 1,000 businesses destroyed during six days of disorder. Then-Governor Spiro Agnew declared martial law and sent in 5,500 National Guardsmen to aid the 1,200 police. Nearly 6,000 people were arrested.

In the wake of the riots, "Warren Hart founded the Baltimore chapter of the BPP in 1968. Less than a year later Hart was accused of operating the Baltimore branch as a social club and was demoted from captain to a rank and file member. Shortly thereafter, he was expelled by the national office for 'irregularities.' As a result, John Clark, who had been active in the organization in Los Angeles, was sent to Baltimore to head the local branch." However in August 1970, Clark was extradited to Los Angeles and charged with possession of a deadly weapon. This, then, clearly was the event that Boyd referred to in his opening remark about Clark being "kidnapped."

As for the crackdown on the BPP, the real crackdown took place on May 1, 1970 (right around Kent State and Jackson State) when the Baltimore police carried out a series of raids on known Panther hangouts and homes. Some 150 police were involved. The Baltimore raids "resulted in four party members being arrested on weapons charges and six members arrested for the murder of Panther Eugene Lee Anderson, a suspected informant."

Needless to say, Boyd was long out of the BPP when the raids occurred.

### **BOYD AS A VICTIM OF CONINTELPRO**

The Baltimore BPP was heavily infiltrated. According to Frank Donner, no police department "placed so heavily an emphasis on informers as a way of neutralizing dissident groups as did Baltimore's Inspectional Services Division." Baltimore had at least four informants.

"The job of one Baltimore informant was to disrupt what was already a tenuous alliance

between the Panthers and the Students for a Democratic Society [SDS]. This informant was instructed to portray SDS as an 'elite corps of chauvinistic whites who wanted to exploit the BPP.' These efforts must have succeeded. A memo dated 26 August 1969 reported: "BPP members have been instructed not to associate with SDS members or attend any SDS affairs." Another memo reported that 'an officer of the Baltimore chapter [name deleted] was expelled from the chapter for his association with an SDS member.'" [Source for the memo is James Davis's 1977 book: *The FBI & the Sixties Antiwar Movement*.]

Of course "[name deleted]" has a name and it is almost certainly Elijah "Zeke" Boyd.

(For a BPP memoir mentioning Zeke Boyd, see [http://www.itsabouttimebpp.com/Chapt...hapter\\_BPP.pdf](http://www.itsabouttimebpp.com/Chapt...hapter_BPP.pdf))

Hence in spite of all the rumors circulated through CP circles during Mop Up that Zeke had been "expelled" from the BPP and that somehow he must have been an "agent," the reality seems to be exactly the opposite. If anything, it was local police informants who forced Boyd out of the BPP even if he claimed he quit on his own volition or was "expelled."

### **"Old Mole take a look at yourself/I'm a lot like you are"**

---

"April 11, 1974

Comrade Hall:

Mutual friends have strongly suggested that I contact you directly.

It is urgent that our leadership establish some efficient form of discreet liaison for (1) frank exchange of information, (2) exploration of areas of agreement for either joint or coordinated public statements and actions. . . . We propose that some agreed form of discreet private contact be established between our leading bodies . . . .

You may contact us directly . . . . The call will be returned by either Costas Axios or myself. If we do not hear from you within three days, we shall contact you either directly or through a friendly third party.

Fraternally

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.  
(L. Marcus)  
Chairman"

**And the "Old Mole Files" TONY Award Goes to . . .**

---

. . . Tony Papert! in the role of an ex-PLer trying to cuddle up to the right wing of the Socialist International.

Tony's billet-doux he exchanged with the soon-to-be SDUSA in the pages of *New America* took place way back when in a magical time. So let's go Slytherin back to YE OLDE MOLE FYLES to learn more.

### **THE SPARTACIST LEAGUE OBJECTS**

"LC Upholds Deal with Socialist Party" reads the title of a leaflet written by Dave Cunningham, a member of the NY Labor Committee as well as the editor of *Spartacist*, the journal of James Robertson's Spartacist League! [We shall explain later on how Cunningham could be a member of BOTH organizations.]

Cunningham reports that in a 16 February 1969 SDS LC meeting, he tried to raise the issue of a Tony Papert article that appeared in the Socialist Party USA journal *New America* on 22 January 1969. Papert's article -- entitled "New Lett's Bourgeois Impulses" -- appeared on page 7 of the 22 January 1969 issue of the ultra bourgeois socialist journal. The editors added a note which read in part: "While *New America* does not agree with Papert's positive orientation to SDS, we believe his analysis is worthy of consideration. The second part of Papert's article will appear in a future issue." [Cunningham copied the article and attached it to his letter.]

Cunningham said he had no intention of joining a branch of YPSL and demanded the meeting repudiate Papert's article. He then said that Paul Milkman -- "one of the few LC cadre who knew of the article ahead of time" and who was chairing the meeting -- immediately called on Bob Dillon who moved a resolution to close off all discussion on this "sectarian" topic.

Cunningham reported that his complaint was also framed as if were a personal attack on Papert, who was extremely popular and a hero of the Columbia Strike. The resolution by Dillon carried by a 2-1 vote. The meeting next voted not to repudiate the article by the same 2-1 majority.

After the vote, the Spartacists left the room. The Workers League members and Harry Turner (a former member of Spartacist League Central Committee who seems to have had his own tiny group) abstained from the vote. Cunningham said that not long after the Spartacists left, however, the Workers League group also was "expelled." Cunningham then remarked that the LC's "hostility to democratic centralism" had now led it to more and more become an "undemocratic clique-dominated group" just like National SDS itself.

The meeting and the failed attempt to repudiate Papert's *New America* essay followed a 13 February 1969 "Open Letter" also by Cunningham attacking Papert's 22 January 1969 article in *New America*. Cunningham said that he found out about the article's preparation more or less by accident. He and Papert were in the same car when the

NYC group was driving to Canada. He recalled that he was stunned by the news that Papert would write for such a journal although Papert dismissed the upcoming article nonchalantly as an attempt to gain free publicity in the bourgeois press in order to overcome the media stereotypes against the LC.

Cunningham pointed out that *New America* wasn't some bourgeois mass paper like the *New York Times*. It was the proud heir of the people who killed Rosa Luxemburg. The SP was a group of "police socialist types" who supported the Bay of Pigs invasion and called for the Vietcong to be smashed. By writing for *New America*, Tony Papert could only give PLP a weapon to bludgeon the SDS Labor Committee.

## **ANALYSIS**

Where to begin?

### **"THE HEMISPHERIC CONFERENCE"**

Let's start with our fellow travelers Papert and Cunningham on their way to Canada in the dead of winter. They were almost certainly headed off to Montreal to attend the "Hemispheric Conference to End the War in Vietnam," a straight-up Soviet-sponsored shindig. (Zeke Boyd also attended this conference as we have already seen.) The conference took place from 28 November-1 December 1968.

The Hemispheric Conference has more or less been written out of history but it is quite interesting and some mention of it must be given here. The conference had been put together by the Soviet-run World Peace Council and its rock star delegates came both from the NLF and North Vietnam. (As we have seen with Boyd, Bobby Seale also spoke there as well although not without controversy.) Yet even though it was a Russian show, the Canadian government refused visas to the semi-official delegation from Moscow in protest against the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia which took place in early August 1968.

The SDS national Office (NO) headed up by the proto-Weatherman Bernadine Dohrn as well as more overtly anarchist groups like the Yippies boycotted the meeting as well. More strikingly so did the Cubans! The Latin American delegations came from the Orthodox Soviet parties that opposed the Cuban-backed "foco" Debray/Guevara line then being pushed by Havana. (The most famous example of the clash came in the debate over the role of the Venezuelan Communist Party. Readers interested in this issue should consult the documents in John Gerassi's 1971 book *The Coming of the New International*.)

The Cubans feared the Soviet plan was to establish a kind of "counter-Tricontinental Conference" that Leonid, not Fidel, would control. The Russians used the prestige of the Vietnamese – with their calls for "unity" – as their wedge against both the Cubans and the Maoists. Needless to say, the Conference organizers saw the proceedings challenged by the various Maoists who attacked the Russian détente line as well as by

independent peace groups that wanted a condemnation of both the U.S. in Vietnam and the Soviets in Prague. Meanwhile the various sects and factions offered workshops and held debates.

## **PAPERT'S ARTICLE**

I have only read the 22 January 1969 article and I will have to look at back issues of *New America* to see if a second part of the Papert story appeared in print as promised. However, the main news thrust of the 22 January story was Papert's analysis of the 26-31 December 1968 SDS NIC (National Interim Conference) in Ann Arbor.

The article stressed that the CP – via its allied “New MOBE” anti-war group -- was trying to move into SDS and more or less turn it into a support group for radicalized students who had entered the Left (like me) from the Eugene McCarthy campaign. In other words, the Soviet-allied CP parties seemingly wanted to build some version of the Pop Front against the Cuban “foco” line that the National Office would promote with the Weatherman debacle.

Papert's argument was actually quite a common one at the time. From Kirkpatrick Sale's *SDS* in his chapter “Fall 1968”: “There was even considerable talk in the air about a merger of SDS with the left-wing Communists and the National Mobilization Committee to form an entirely new group which would outlaw PL from the start. Dohrn labeled this talk ‘pure and simple trash’ in a *New Left Notes* article in December, but it certainly had wide currency in the organization and represented the thinking of at least some SDS veterans.” (494-95)

## **“ALBERT SHANKER ‘JOINS’ THE LABOR COMMITTEE”?**

If Papert's analysis of the future of SDS read like a sophisticated (if erroneous) portrait of the group written by a well-educated insider, the next question has to be: What was it doing in *New America*, the journal of the SP/YPSL, an organization that prided itself on socialist anti-communism and itself the American branch of the Second International?

One educated guess would be that the fact that the LC supported (although it should be added “critically supported”) the New York City Teachers in their opposition to community control almost certainly played a major factor. Albert Shanker – the long time head of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) which he had virtually founded -- had given an interview during the strike in which he said something like “even SDS supports us.” Shanker was also a prominent member of the Socialist Party, the American branch of the Second International.

In late October 1968, “Columbia SDS” voted to expel the SDS Labor Committee because they were embarrassed that “SDS” was being advertised as backing the teachers. This idea enraged the rest of SDS that identified with Rodney McCoy and the black nationalists and opposed the AFT. They felt – with reason -- that SDS was being mis-categorized since most of SDS opposed the AFT. Hence the LC “expulsion.” The

LC was next “expelled” in a December 1968 SDS regional meeting with PL backing the expulsion.

PL appears to have blocked with their opponents in SDS against the SDS Labor Committee even though the PL paper *Challenge* itself had accused the black nationalists of being fronts for groups like the Ford Foundation. The LC’s views on the strike can be prefigured in articles in the PL press. But at the time of the strike, PL was in a fight with both the anarchists and the National Office and apparently felt that aligning against the black nationalists and in support of “State Department Socialists” like Shanker would be the political kiss of death. Of course the NO famously “expelled” PL in the summer 1969 conference while PL, in turn, simultaneously “expelling” the RYM-1/Weatherman faction at the same conference.)

### **BERNADINE DOHRN DOES NOT JOIN THE LABOR COMMITTEE**

In an 18 December 1968 article in *New Left Notes* entitled “Labor Committee Statement: Pure and Simple Trash,” Bernadine Dohrn (“SDS Inter-Organizational Secretary”) replied to a 16 December 1968 LC press release printed in the same issue of *New Left Notes*. (Note: It is this very article by Dohrn that Kirkpatrick Sale quotes in his book.)

First we examine the LC statement reprinted in *New Left Notes*. It began: “The continuing factional dispute inside of Students for a Democratic Society has taken an incredible turn. The anarchist-National Office staff coalition plans to merge SDS with the most right wing parts of the movement, the National Mobilization Committee and the so-called left caucus of the Communist Party. The merged organization will have as its purpose the organization of ‘youth-as-a-class.’

“The merger plans an SDS-Mobilization committee joint demonstration in Washington at Nixon’s inauguration, another bloody and senseless confrontation with the police. Several members of the National Interim Council of SDS, including Jeff Jones of NYC, have been publicly backing this demonstration. This is to be followed by the formation of a joint organization with Mobilization and the CP caucus, ostensibly to ‘defend the movement’ (the National Lawyers Guild will serve as a front for the merger), at the December 27-31 SDS National Council meeting in Ann Arbor. Complete merger of the three groups is projected for the June 1969 convention.” The press release then went on to assert that the main barrier to the merger was the presence of PL. It offered critical support to PL while demanding that PL reverse its anti-LC views and oppose any exclusionary procedures to groups like the SDS LC.

In her response, Dohrn described the way National SDS had addressed the LC:

“This fall the Labor Committee issued leaflets in the name of SDS supporting the teachers’ union in the NY schools crisis. Columbia SDS and the NY regional assembly had condemned the racist teachers’ strike and demanded that the Labor Committee not continue to produce pro-teachers’ union leaflets in the name of SDS, contrary to the



position taken by the membership. When the leaflets continued, the Columbia chapter 'expelled' the Labor Committee – to publicly disclaim leaflets claiming to represent the position of SDS. Neither individual members nor the ideas of the Labor Committee were ousted from participation in SDS. The 'expulsion' was to discredit the Labor Committee as spokesman for SDS."

Then in a new paragraph headed "Labor Committee Still Using SDS Name," Dohrn continued: "Later, a NY regional assembly dissolved the NY SDS regional labor committee – which had become the organization called the Labor Committee – and set up a new regional committee on labor. As can be seen from the Labor Committee's press release, they are still using the name SDS Labor Committee."

In fact Dohrn had the admittedly highly confusing facts sort of on her side. The basic issue turned out to revolve around the fact that there were TWO linked "SDS Labor Committees" which were at times the same Committee and at times not the same!

### **WHAT'S IN A NAME . . .**

The "SDS Labor Committee" did evolve out of the "Marcus" CIPA/SDS Labor Committee clique. The officially SDS endorsed SDS Labor Committee was created in the summer of 1968. In a 24 June 1968 issue of *New Left Notes*, the "Philadelphia and New York Labor Committee" was given a full page to elaborate their demand that: "SDS should encourage the formation throughout the country of committees through which radicals can work with and propagandize workers and poor people. Further, the forms and tactics of these committees should be relevant to the present state of capitalist economy and society – a crisis which is opening increasingly obvious and intense weaknesses and failures in the total system for the first time since the Second World War, the first time in our lifetime."

It seems clear then the Marcus-CIPA allied "SDS Labor Committee" clique in Philadelphia and New York lobbied National SDS to create an national organization also called the "SDS Labor Committee." Hence there were two separate but intertwined organizations!

It is THIS National "SDS Labor Committee" created sometime in the summer of 1968 and NOT the "SDS Labor Committee" – a separate organization with Marcus, Papert, Fraser, Leif Johnson and others that first emerged out of CIPA-FUNY in 1966-67 -- that Spartacist League member Dave Cunningham belonged to and which National SDS later abolished. In fact, the "Marcusites" were not alone in supporting the New York City Teachers against the proponents of "community control." The Spartacists, the Workers League (two groups that LaRouche had been a member of before becoming an independent in 1966) as well as the Harry Turner split-off from the Spartacists also seem to have critically supported the teachers strike as well. They were all part of the broader "SDS Labor Committee."

This fact helps explain why Dave Cunningham could issue a leaflet listing himself

BOTH as a member of the “SDS Labor Committee” and a Spartacist leader. He was a member of the group that had been endorsed by National SDS in the summer of 1968 and which Bernadine Dohrn -- speaking clearly for the majority inside SDS as well as for the NO leadership -- ordered dissolved.

## CONCLUSION

Alas, none of the above helps explains the absurd situation of Papert writing for *New America* even at the same time that the LC was ostensibly trying to align with PL against the NO “anarchists” and proto-Weatherman. As Cunningham correctly asks in his statement: Why did Papert seem to give ammunition to its enemies in PL and elsewhere and offer up a golden opportunity to bash the SDS Labor Committee as being in some kind of alliance with “State Department Socialist” Albert Shanker? In fact, if one looks at the very first George Morris attacks on the NCLC in the *Daily World* in 1971-72 (that is to say, pre-Operation Mop-Up), he clearly believes that the LC is somehow allied to the “AFL-CIA” types in Social Democracy!

At the time Cunningham learned about the proposed *New America* article – assuming we are correct that Cunningham and Papert were in a car driving to Canada in late November 1968 for the Montreal Conference – the National Office hadn’t issued any statement at all on the future of the SDS Labor Committee. By agreeing to publish an article in *New America*, Papert seemed to be deliberately eroding the claim that the SDS Labor Committee was offering critical support to the teachers and not working in any fixed alliance either with the AFT leadership or the Socialist Party/Second International. It was for just this reason that Cunningham tried to get the still functioning – in spite of Dohrn’s pronouncement – SDS Labor Committee to repudiate Papert’s article.

Finally, one of the most curious aspects of the NCLC story has to be the group’s wacky relationship/fixation with the Second International which we can no date as far back as the fall of 1968.

In the fall of 1968, the LC clearly backed the Socialist International-allied AFT. Papert’s decision to publicly write for *New America* on the ins and outs of SDS only seems to highlight this link. Needless to say, Papert also attacks the SP’s *bête noire*, the Communist Party, for its alleged plans to take over SDS in cahoots with the National Office.

The arguments inside SDS and in Trotskyist groups like the Spartacists and Workers League in support of the strike totally enraged the “Mark Rudd” contingent at Columbia headed by people like the late Ted Gold. The Rudd faction carried out a series of threats and even assaults on the Marcus followers. It was under these conditions that LaRouche and Carol wrote “The New Left, Local Control and Fascism,” a *Campaigner* article that could also be seen as independently confirming many of the fears about the New Left held by the Socialist International; namely that it was an irrationalist Mussolini-like and potentially proto-fascist formation, an ironic view to say

the least given the NCLC's own future path.

Yet in the years that followed – and really starting most in the attacks the LC began on the Socialist International-allied UAW in particular as well as the Palme and Brandt governments in Europe -- the Socialist International would become a leading promoter of the notion that the LC had somehow been co-opted or taken over by either the KGB or the East German Stasi. FOIA documents – for example -- clearly show that the SP's Roy Godson stressed the idea that the LC must have had either Soviet or East German connections even though he never managed to produce any credible evidence that this was in fact the case.

But going back to the very early period of the LC, one question arises: Did the SP/Socialist International make any effort to promote the LC as a potential buffer against its opponents in both Moscow and Havana?

Were there even financial overtures to the early LC along these lines?

Stay tuned.

---

*Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 06-06-2009 at 04:37 PM.*

## **Time Line Questions**

---

The murky history of the early LC has led to this electronic correction.

You wrote: The "SDS Labor Committee" did evolve out of the "Marcus" CIPA/SDS Labor Committee clique. The officially SDS endorsed SDS Labor Committee was created in the summer of 1968."

Wait a second. The original "SDS Labor Committee" (pre-Columbia strike) did not consist entirely of members of the clique. I believe it was initially a committee of Columbia SDS; it might have become (or claimed to be) a committee of NY Regional SDS (don't remember). It was an "official" SDS committee.

I'm pretty sure that the "SDS Labor Committee" was established in 1967; in any event, it was in existence in early 1968. There were "anti-Marcusites" involved in it. It was contested territory.

in other news -- McCoy's first name was Rhody."

## **ANSWER**

Rhody it is.

There was an SDS Labor Committee that was not the LaRouche group. This we both agree on. This is why you could be Dave Cunningham and be a Spart and still be a

member. It was an SDS-sanctioned group that had been set up in the summer of 1968 as evidenced by the June article in *New Left Notes* that I cite.

But this does not mean that you are wrong either. It may have been that in both Philadelphia and New York there had been created "SDS Labor Committees" on the regional level and the Summer 68 proposal in *New Left Notes* was meant to make national something that had developed on a local level.

The first indication I have of the LC and SDS in print is Leif Johnson's article in the 5 February 1968 issue of *New Left Notes* in an article entitled "NY SDS to Organize Against Transit Fare Increase." It opens: "During the spring term, people from Columbia, City, Brooklyn, and Queens College SDSs and other chapters in the region are undertaking a campaign to block a fare increase on the New York City buses and subways." The first major leafleting "took place in December 1967." Leif also adds that in Boston similar fare campaign was being waged (presumably by PL).

However Leif **does not** refer to the campaign with the words "SDS Labor Committee." However this campaign may have been later dubbed part of the SDS Labor Committee in the New York area and which did in fact precede the Columbia Strike. So maybe we are talking about the same grouping which in February 1968 wasn't called the "SDS Labor Committee" but later did become a local/regional recognized body of SDS.

I have no idea exactly when the Marcus grouping adopted the name SDS Labor Committee. My guess is that maybe they were the driving force in the local New York SDS Labor Committee and so adopted their name from that project?

However what is clear is that there was a regional action starting as early as December 1967 around the fare hike proposals and this later seems to have become a regional "SDS Labor Committee" and by the summer of 1968 -- pre-teachers strike -- there was a push by the regionals in New York and Philly to have SDS back a national version.

That's the best I can do. Unfortunately, since there was no national paper and this even predates the first issues of the New York paper distributed in the garment center, I'm not sure there are any existing print sources that can be consulted.

---

*Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 06-07-2009 at 12:11 PM.*

### **What's in a Name -- Part II -- Philadelphia First?**

This is the LC's history as presented in part one of a series on the group's origins that appeared on 18 December 1970 in *New Solidarity* and co-written by Steve Komm and Tony Papert.

"The formal inauguration of the Labor Committee faction occurred at a meeting of Students for Democratic Society's New York-New Jersey region in Princeton, New Jersey, in late November 1967.

Two Columbia SDS members, Tony Papert and Steve Komm, had come to the meeting independently to present the same proposal: the formation of a New York SDS Transit Project to support a possible subway strike and oppose a possible transit fare increase, both being threatened for January 1968. . . .

Around the cited immediate and longer-range goals of the SDS Transit Project there coalesced three distinct groupings from within the New York radical movement: first, the Village-Chelsea Committee for Independent Political Action, represented in the early Transit Project by Robert Dillon, an anthropology graduate student at Columbia; second, the future “Fraser-Papert faction” of Progressive Labor, represented by Tony Papert, chairman of Columbia’s PLP chapter, or “club”; third, an independent SDS stratum represented by Steve Komm, a Columbia sophomore, and Leif Johnson, an SDS activist since Port Huron.”

In an Appendix published in *New Solidarity* to part one of the Komm-Papert history of the LC and the Columbia strike in particular, LaRouche contributed more information. Village CIPA emerged out of people recruited from the FUNY classes. The major recruiter for CIPA was Bob Dillon. The first publication of CIPA was a mimeographed document called “A Second Front against the War in Vietnam” oriented towards housing and related issues. *Third Stage of Imperialism* appeared in April 1967 by Marcus and “published at the initial instigation of Robert Dillon” *Third Stage* became an essential founding document of the NCLC.

Both documents were circulated widely particularly at Columbia. They kept Village CIPA going when West Side CIPA and East Side CIPA collapsed in 1967. The followers of Marcus’s views next became active in the founding of the West Side Tenants Union. According to Marcus, “They provided the Democratic Society [? – presumably SDS but maybe the left-wing of the Democratic Party with anti-war ex-CP types} organization, in which latter organization Village-CIPA members were drawn into increasing cooperation with the later Papert-Fraser faction of Progressive Labor Party and with other forces within the New York City “New Left.”

“The West Side Tenants Union (WSTU) was formed in the late summer of 1967 by members of West Village CIPA (including Robert Dillon) and recent graduates from the Columbia School of Social Work (Ed Spannaus and Tom Karp). The original conception was that of Tom Karp’s, developed while he and Spannaus were graduate students at Columbia. Karp’s ideas about community organizing were combined with the tax-the-landlord program of West Village CIPA in the Tenant Union project.”

“Karp’s original idea was based on his reading of the history of tenant organizing in New York City, as well as experience he and Spannaus had had while working in the Community Action Program of Local 1199 during 1966-67.” The Tenant Union program in turn “was a significant factor in the development of the Fraser-Papert faction in PLP, and was discussed at considerable length in the first version of *Economism or Socialism*, the Fraser-Papert document presented to PLP.” This led to the development of a faction with this view in the SDS Transit Project.

Fraser also went to Philadelphia to organize for PL in the summer of 1967 which set the growth of what would become the Philly LC. As a result of his efforts, a study group was created in Philadelphia which apparently first developed the name SDS Labor Committee as a SEPARATE grouping.

In "The History of the Labor Committee: Part Five: The Philadelphia Story" by Gofdon Fels in the 5 March 1971 issue of *New Solidarity*, we get the fullest description of the origins of the name:

**"The winter 67-68 study group took on the name of the Philadelphia SDS Labor Committee. A note on the "SDS" name. The New York pre-LC group was functioning, among other areas, as an actual committee of New York SDS, engaged with PLP in fighting a proposed subway fare hike. . . . The birth of an independent SDS LC (the current National Caucus of Labor Committees) would not actually come in New York until May 1968, during the Columbia strike, in which LCer's played leading roles. Therefore, in Philadelphia the adoption of the name SDS LC and the activity conducted under this name as early as February 1968 actually constituted the first independent LC activity in the country."**

This is the best I can do using NCLC sources as to the origin of the name.

If Fels is correct, NYC adopted the name that Philadelphia had been using only in May 1968. Then in June, as we have seen, there is a move to create regional SDS Labor Committees as an SDS project which was separate from the Marcus group but related to it as it seems a logical extension of the SDS Transit Project, the 1967 proposal introduced at the Princeton SDS meeting.

### **"Goons on the Left": From the "Cutting Edge" of the Old Mole Files**

On 8 September 1974 two NCLC dissidents named Marian Kester and Dan Jacobs issued a leaflet entitled "Goons on the Left." In it, they declared that the NCLC had now become "a Stalinist GPU-type operation designed to satiate the paranoid fantasies of L. Marcus." They called for "an open investigation into the 'security' apparatus" and warned that "the failure to decapitate this bureaucratic ogre [security] will mean the failure of the revolution."

However what is most interesting in their description of the fate of other dissident NCLC members following the Chris White Affair debacle. Kester/Jacobs reported that the attempt of the NCLC to claim that there was some kind of organized anti-LC cabal was absurd. However, they noted that Bob Dillon, Henry Weinfeld (who had helped convinced Christine Berl to escape from the NCLC), and Mike Colen -- each on separate occasions -- had contacted the NYC Police Intelligence Division because they were afraid of being attacked by the NCLC. Dillon reportedly contacted the police once in January 1974. Kester and Jacobs added that Mike Colen was "under surveillance" and was harassed while Bob Dillon -- who contacted the police once in January 1974 --

actually fled New York City.

Kester and Jacobs reported they too had been subjected to harassment, surveillance, gag rules, and physical attacks. They then denounced Security's attempt to portray Colen as some kind of agent because he worked for Chase Manhattan and was engaged in a study of Stalinism. They also said the attacks on Helene Hammer were equally bogus. According to the Kester/Jacobs statement, on 19 August 1974 LaRouche issued "Psychological Profile of a Model CIA Agent" that was directly aimed to destroy Mike Colen, who had quit the LC after January 1974.

However their most interesting claim involved someone named Kengas. They state in August 1974, "a much more serious reported incident, the beating and stabbing of this guy Kengas in California." They say they only know about this incident from letters Kangas sent to the NCLC.

## **ANALYSIS**

The Kester/Jacobs leaflet appeared just after *NS* published two attacks on the "NAG group" on 21 August and 28 August 1974. In the 28 August story, entitled "Inside the NAG Network: How the CIA Works," the paper attacked Colen and others including the West-Coast-based Paul Kengas.

*NS* claimed that the "CIA" would push the line that the LC is "undemocratic" and Security is a "GPU secret police" and that LaRouche is "another Stalin." The paper said that "Mike Colon (Colen)" "infiltrated" the LC in 1971 and left the LC in January 1974 and that he had been a Russian Studies student at Columbia. It turned out he had a job in the "Computer Division International Section" at One Chase Manhattan Plaza and that he was writing "a book on 'The Labor Committees and Stalinism' on his job!" The paper also said that Colen and Hammer were responsible for mailing out Christine Berl's resignation statement from the LC.

As for Kengas, "this infantile anarchist creature" was "thwarted in his attempt to infiltrate the Labor Committees partly as a result of his punk need to carry his 'toys' around with him. He was found with MACE and other weapons on him at the May [1974] Labor Committee conference, interrogated and sent packing." He was now active on the West Coast organizing against the LC.

More recently, Kengas "has run up and down the West Coast postering and calling for the convening of 'peoples' courts" charging Labor Committee Security with "torture," kidnapping, and robbery, while at the same time organizing on parallel lines to the Labor Committee." A counter-intelligence phone call to Kengas "established that he is collaborating with the East Coast NAG-Red Flag operation and has '10 or 12 people hassled by the LC interested in putting out a newspaper.'"

The Kester/Jacobs letter is just one (rare) expression of an attempted public protest against the takeover by the Security-LaRouche operation from Mop-Up to the Chris

White Affair and beyond. What it also shows is just how much Security ran "black operations" against any dissidents who questioned the LC's path, even to the extent of driving Bob Dillon from New York.

Clearly Security's covert operations against dissident LCers very much remains an untold story. Given that the organization actually put Nat Hentoff under surveillance, it seems perfectly believable that they would have gone after former dissident members with even greater ferocity.

But did the attacks lead to an attempted stabbing of Kengas as well?

Unfortunately The Old Mole Files don't include Kengas's letters so we only have the Kester/Jacobs testimony to rely on for this particular claim.

---

*Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 06-09-2009 at 12:05 AM.*

### **An old mole files sampler**

Some notes taken from individual Old Mole Files and presented in no particular order:

- 1) Nancy Spannaus is the daughter of Donald Bradeen, a professor of Classics at the University of Cincinnati. Ed Spannaus's father was reportedly a Lutheran minister.
- 2) In 1961, Lyn Marcus was suspended by the SWP leadership for accusing several individuals in the YSA of being police agents on the basis of information gained by another SWP member who had been a bodyguard of Trotsky's in Mexico and a member of the SWP's Security unit. In 1963, Marcus was expelled.

**ANALYSIS:** I have never heard of this story before. Also LaRouche clearly left the SWP in 1966 and not 1963. However as we have seen, Roy Frankhouser was involved with the SWP in the late 1950s and established a connection with Carol's husband as I have documented on FactNet.

- 3) At the time of Operation Mop-UP, the Spartacist League paper *Workers Vanguard* reprinted excerpts from secret internal LC documents (I think one of them may have been "Challenge of Left Hegemony"). A former LC/SLCER living in Philadelphia named Les L commented upon reading the excerpts sagely observed that the LC had gone the way of "Rennie Davis" – who had joined an Indian guru cult.

**ANALYSIS:** I have yet to look at back issues of *Workers Vanguard* from this period so I can't determine just what appeared in print or the Spartacist League analysis of LaRouche, who – it may be recalled – was briefly a member of the Spartacist League. (Carol even was listed as an editor of the Spartacist League paper.)

- 4) From an article in the 26 April 1976 issue of the *St. Paul Pioneer Press* out of St. Paul, Minnesota. The paper reports on a speech given by Retired US Army Lt. Col. Arch



Roberts, head of the ultra-right Committee to Restore the Constitution (CRC) and a former aide to General Edwin Walker.

Roberts claimed that Nelson Rockefeller was behind a “fascist plot” to take over America. The coup would take place during the planned 1976 Bicentennial festivities in Philadelphia. Protestors would violently clash with the police leading to the intervention of the National Guard thus leading to the creation of a “state of national emergency.” Using the rigged protests and clashes as a pretext, the crisis would be used to place “all power in the hands of the Presidency.”

**ANALYSIS:** Amazingly, NCLC Security had virtually an identical line regarding the 1976 Bicentennial Celebration in 1976. The “TIP” (*Terrorist Information Project*) Brief was part of Security’s attempt to sell this idea. The NCLC even claimed that the Institute for Policy Studies (IPS) was even contemplating employing nuclear terrorism to effect the Rockefeller-directed coup.

5) On 19 April 1973, Lucy St. John on behalf of the Healyite Workers League offered support to the CPUSA against NCLC “Operation Mop-Up” attacks.

**ANALYSIS:** Even the Healyites thought the LC acted like thugs!

6) The Old Mole Files include two separate reports [6 (a) and 6 (b)] on Fred Newman and the Centers for Change. (Here I have edited any overlapping information. I should also add that the ex-IWP website also includes a document written by the Centers for Change/IWP giving a detailed version of its own history for those interested in learning more. -- HH)

#### 6 (a) CFC Background

Centers for Change (CFC) emerged out of CUNY’s main campus on 137 St. It started in the spring of 1968 as a small collective known as IF....THEN. I/T prided itself on distributing the most obscene and pornographic propaganda. I/T next set up a storefront in the area around 168th Street in Washington Heights in May 1968 but by July 1968 there was a split and the storefront folded. During its brief period of existence, it received some contributions from radical faculty members.

A small group from I/T stayed together and created yet another storefront called Encounter House which for a time was located around Wadsworth Avenue and then at 3890 Sedgewich Ave. in the Bronx. The group wanted to incorporate and because the name “Encounter House” was legally owned by a drug rehab center, they chose the name Centers for Change. By the spring of 1969, CFC had gotten some money from the Urban Confrontation Program run out of Sloan House YMCA which seems to have been an encounter-session type group meant to show suburban white teenagers the reality of ghetto life if I am reading this correctly. CFC also created the Robin Hood Relearning Company and the New World School, a free school created in September 1969 but which rapidly collapsed. In the fall of 1969 there was a large infusion of

“feminist consciousness” into CFC.

#### 6 (b): CFC and the NCLC

The first I/T split took place in July 1968. The group that set up Encounter House was a minority of just nine people. The key person who pushed the alliance with the LC was Hazel Daren. She had also worked with some of the Maoists from Class War in NU-WRO. Another CFC member named Fran Costa backed Hazel Daren’s idea that CFC should enter into some kind of alliance with the NCLC. The leading CFC member who opposed the alliance was Jim Retherford, the editor of the CFC paper *Right on Time*. He also reportedly helped ghost-write Jerry Rubin’s book *Do It*. Retherford wanted CFC to work with groups like Venceremos Brigade, RU, and other New Left groups. He despised the LC and left CFC when the group joined the LC.

**ANALYSIS:** As mentioned, the best history of CFC can be found in a CFC pamphlet now available on the ex-IWP member website. Still, both these separate reports are interesting. Probably the second is most striking for the fact that it was Hazel Daren and NOT Fred Newman who apparently pioneered the push for some kind of CFC-NCLC alliance.

#### **The Mystery Man with the Fake Right Hand! -- The Conclusion of the Old Mole Files**

The strangest Old Mole File goes back to the very early 1970s. The documents consist of a hand-written letter, a typed letter and notes from a long taped interview.

[The events in question span the time leading up to the split between Marcus and Fraser, the expulsion of the Fraser faction and the creation of SLC publications like *Crisis*, *Quantum*, and *Perspectives*. Needless to say, what follows is most strange and should be taken as grounds for possible future investigation. – HH]

#### *From the Old Mole Files: The Mystery of “Myron Nisloss”*

In the early days of the NCLC before the split with the Fraser group, there would appear at New York meetings a strange figure named Myron Nisloss. (The name is spelled phonetically from the notes of the 1973 recording and the last name could be Nissloss or even Misslos or Missloss. Again this is a phonetic rendering of the name and I am interpreting the hand written notes.) It was thought that “Marcus had the closest relationship” with Myron and they had been in the SWP together.

Myron was a short trim man who always dressed sharply. He would travel with an extremely good-looking young woman. Most strange of all, he had a false right hand and gave the impression of being a “James Bond type.” His last known address is given as 100 West 57th Street in Manhattan although whether that was a residence or business address is unclear. He was thought to be either some kind of currency speculator or investor.

Myron reportedly:

- 1) gave the NCLC \$2,000 a month.
- 2) loaned Zeke Boyd \$2,500 to help get his younger brother out of a legal problem involving drug charges.
- 3) donated some \$10,000 to the Fraser-Borgmann Defense.
- 4) gave the Greeks money but reportedly got angry at them because he was pro-Israel and they were anti-Israel.

At the time of the split, Myron indicated he would go with the Fraser/SLC faction. But he gradually dropped away from Fraser and the impression was that he withdrew from any involvement in politics.

“Gordon Vector”

Another typed letter tells the story of someone who sounds very much like Myron. From the typed letter we read that there was a man around 46 years old who was reportedly a Zionist and an international money speculator “who, I am sure, went by the name of Gordon Vector.” Vector only attended meetings in New York City and the author saw him at one meeting in July 1970 and one in September 1970. He reportedly gave the NCLC a lot of money. Fraser then asked him for money for the SLC in early 1971 but was turned down.

The source believes that Gordon Vector gave Marcus both money and information on “Meyer Kayhane” [JDL leader Meir Kahane] and someone named “Crystler (July 1970)” and he may have tried to encourage the CIA to sponsor Marcus. Since Myron and Gordon Vector are almost certainly the same person, it may be that “Gordon Vector” was some kind of “party name.”

Whatever the case, along with LaRouche and Carol, he was the only “adult” at the meetings. It was also clear that he knew LaRouche and Carol very well, again suggesting that they first met in the SWP.

### **ANALYSIS:**

Perhaps the most fascinating reference is Myron/Gordon Vector’s hostility to the “Greeks” over the question of Israel as “the Greeks” were in fact allied to the Democratic Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (DPFLP), the most pro-Moscow of all the Palestinian armed resistance groups. And Myron/Gordon might even be referenced in the pages of *New Solidarity* in this context.

The 14-16 June 1970 issue of *New Solidarity* carried an article on the 28-29 May

Strategy for Socialism II Conference held at the Beacon Hotel at 75 St. and Broadway, and the first NCLC conference that followed the SLC split just a few months before. The article penned by Tony Chaitkin is entitled “International Viewpoint Stressed by Speakers from Europe, Middle East.” It begins: “A conference here on international socialist strategy heard a critical self-analysis of the left wing of the Palestine resistance movement and discussed plans for building a European revolutionary movement.

“Ahmed Khayali, spoke for the Democratic Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (DPF), Jannis Tzavellas for the Greek revolutionary group ESO, Roger Hartog for the socialist GI newspaper, THE NEXT STEP, and L. Marcus and Eric Lerner for the National Caucus of Labor Committees.

“Khayali analyzed the weaknesses of the DPF and the resistance movement in general – chauvinism, careerism, reliance on and ‘non-interference with’ Arab governments, and overemphasis on the military aspect of the movement, instead of politicizing and preparing the masses. . . . The DPF is a Marxist split-off from the airline-hijacking Popular Front headed by George Habash. . . . [the DPF] call for a ‘secular, socialist, anti-imperialist state’ to contain both Jewish and Arab communities, with all citizens on an equal basis, and the preservation of all ‘religious and cultural heritages.’”

Yet what is most interesting in the article from our point of view comes in this paragraph: “A forum held earlier that week at Columbia University in New York was disrupted by a pro-Zionist member of the so-called Socialist Labor Committee, who interrupted statements critical of Israeli policies being made by both Mr. Khayali and by Peter Brand of the NCLC. When this screaming SLC member labeled Brand as a ‘traitor,’ a ‘Jewish butcher,’ and a ‘Judenrat’ among other epithets, the meeting’s chairman, George Turner, expelled him.”


Was Myron/Gordon the “pro-Zionist” SLC member in question?

**CODA:** With this excerpt we now CLOSE The Old Mole Files once and for all even though there still are many more documents than the ones mentioned here.

Finally, there is also this remark which I have been asked to repeat: *“To the Members of the Plum Street Collective Who Never Were ‘Just’: Can You Still Recall the Tickle of the Mustache?”*

End of the Old Mole Files

Quote:

Originally Posted by **borisbad** 

*I certainly remember Myron from the earliest days of meetings that were held before the offices moved either to 29th St. or later up to Amsterdam Avenue and 99th St. (for the NYC local and 59th St. for the National office). He and his girlfriend, who was very*

*attractive, certainly did not seem like the types that you would see attending left wing gatherings. I'm not sure if I'm accurate, but I also seem to recall Myron having a little memo book at which he would be writing notes during meetings. I also vaguely recall that he helped Solidarity get published or pay its printers. He left very early on and I don't recall him ever speaking out.*

*I think that the pro-Zionist member at the LC Conference may have been Don Fow not his actual name but it sounded similar to Don Phau's name. (This Don always had a soft spot for Israel). As far as I know despite his views on Israel and Zionism, this older guy is still active with the organization if he's still alive. I never seemed to have heard Myron speak up at any meeting, but it is possible I missed that "intervention" if he was the one who criticized Peter Brand.*

*I also remember the conference where the DPF representative spoke. It certainly appeared that we were becoming a new "Fifth International" at that point. Also as far as Next Step, I'm not sure, but wasn't Michael Vail there also for Next Step?*

First, my goof. The Chaitkin *New Solidarity* article was dated from 1971 and **NOT** 1970. Yet another typo.

Second, the person we are talking about was with the SLC. Was Don Fow? I thought he was also from Philadelphia but I don't remember him there. Did he join early as well. Was he originally from New York?

As for Myron, can you remember his last name? Also what about "Gordon Vector"? And although you give the addresses of where the LC later met, you don't give the original address for meetings when Myron would be there. Do you remember the original address? What the room looked like? Etc. What kind of chairs? Was there a window? Etc.

Also someone thinks Myron and LaRouche may have met through a chess club and not the SWP Does this ring any bells? (I believe there still is a famous chess club active in the West Village.) Also with *Solidarity*, Was he paying for *Solidarity* which was basically just a cheap sheet distributed to garment workers or *New Solidarity*?

And when TNS joined, Vale was part of the LC but I have no idea if he attended the 1971 conference. In fact, I am pretty sure TNS only officially joined the LC later in 1972. Maybe the article on TNS on LaRouche Planet will give the exact time-table.

---

*Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 06-10-2009 at 11:33 AM.*

## THE NEW MOLE FILES

---

### INTRODUCTION:

The New Mole Files is a compilation from a variety of sources that document the earliest history of what would become the Labor Committee. I am electronically posting the findings because the sources are so rare and I believe they will complete the project begun by the Old Mole Files that first took us back to the early origins of the group. In this survey we go from 19 -- the journal of the West Side Committee for Independent Political Action (CIPA) -- to *New America* and even *Workers Vanguard* and from 1966 to 1973.

Because much of the information is so dense, my approach has been to highlight the parts I found most interesting so that other researchers or historians/grad students etc. who want to know more about the group, are aware of these sources.

With the completion of this series of New Mole File postings, I've pretty much exhausted my personal interest in the very early days of the Labor Committee.

The origins of the Fraser-Papert faction in NY PLP or the murky evolution of the "Bavarians" out of the Labor Committee and their subsequent brief existence as the Socialist Labor Committee (SLC) will have to be researched by someone else with more knowledge about these topics. The very early origins of LC chapters in places like Philadelphia and Baltimore -- although discussed to some degree in the Old Mole Files -- also would have to be further researched by others interested in the group.

Here we dwell almost exclusively on the initial handful of proto-LC members in the New York City area starting in mid-1966, the year LaRouche finally left the organized Trotskyist movement. After his sojourn through the SWP finally ended in 1965, LaRouche briefly became part of the Workers League (then known as the American Committee for the Fourth International -- ACFI). After LaRouche was rejected by Healy for a top leadership position in the U.S. organization in the winter of 1965, he even more briefly joined the Spartacist League while Carol ("Carol Lawrence") served as an editor for the SL paper *Spartacist*. LaRouche also contributed an unsigned lead article -- "Battle for Asia" for the June-July 1966 issue of "*Spartacist*."

### CIPA

We start the New Mole Files with CIPA.

Some background:

In the summer of 1966 LaRouche began his Marxist economics class at the Free University of New York (FUNY). Around that same time, the West Side Committee for

Independent Political Action (West Side CIPA) had been launched to try to elect a Socialist candidate, James Weinstein, to the 19th Congressional District in Manhattan. An ex-CPer who left the CP in 1956 and a former editor of *Studies on the Left* with an M.A. in history from Columbia, Weinstein had written a study of the U.S. Socialist Party and through West Side CIPA, he hoped to reinvigorate the idea of Socialists participating in elections.

West Side CIPA soon inspired other CIPA groups across New York including one in the East Side and later the West Village-Chelsea CIPA where LaRouche first established his own independent presence in the New Left. The CIPA project attracted a remarkable number of supporters from across the city and CIPA became a kind of proto-formation for the coalition of progressive Democrats who later emerged in both the Eugene McCarthy and later the George McGovern campaign. New York CIPA was also part of a larger national project from many people who had been influenced by the Henry Wallace campaign to try and develop leftwing electoral politics again.

National CIPA was actually established in a meeting in Chicago in 1966 – the Rev. James Bevel even played a prominent role in its founding. Jim Weinstein’s campaign – even though he never expected to win the 19th Congressional District – was one of the first major attempts by an avowed Socialist to enter the electoral arena. Along with Weinstein, other prominent New York New Leftists like Stanley Aronowitz played a leading role in CIPA.

At the same time that CIPA and FUNY were being launched, the Socialist Scholars Conference was also taking off in New York as well. As FUNY itself began as an SDS project, so too SDS was looking around for radical projects to develop in the Northern industrial cities. By the mid-1960s, SDS was pursuing many different courses of action and strategy, one of which was to see if it were possible to reach the broader public with radical economic demands. Individual members from SDS campus chapters in New York embraced the CIPA campaign. Meanwhile other radicals involved in social work and welfare organizing were also looking for new programmatic ideas to organize in the North.

It was within this larger political context that LaRouche got his start as an “independent” Leftist. Gone were the historical, cultural and ideological trappings of the old Trotskyist movement that he had spent some two decades around. Now he entered the world of the New Left.

## 19

CIPA published a regular newsletter entitled “19” – named after the 19th Congressional District --- out of West Side CIPA’s headquarters at 388 Amsterdam Avenue. I’ve only been able to examine a couple of issues of 19, but they are quite interesting for the pre-history of the LC.

In the 27 September 1966 issue of 19, there is an article “Welfare Demonstrators

Arrested” which reports on a coalition of some 60 welfare groups involved in a city-wide campaign. This coalition, the City-Wide Coordinating Committee, organized the protest. One of the five people arrested was none other than Jeannette Washington. There is also a photo of Washington with Columbia Professor Richard Cloward. The City-Wide Coordinating Committee was a precursor organization for the National Welfare Rights Organization (NWRO). Jeanette Washington became a NWRO leader. In 1972-73 as the NWRO began to decline, Jeanette Washington became a critical leader in the NCLC-sponsored NU-WRO grouping. As we shall see, it seems more than likely that the “Labor Committee” connection to Washington actually dates back to this proto-period of 1966.

This same issue includes a picture with a caption listing some CIPA members campaigning in the streets of New York. One of the CIPA members named is “Richard Sober.” This is almost certainly the Richard Sober who became a leading figure in the very early Labor Committee and who died sometime in the mid-1970s. It is hard to say 100%, however, if it is the LC Richard Sober as his back is to the camera.

Finally *19* also carries an ad for classes at FUNY on 20 E.14th Street.

The 9 September 1966 issue of *19* includes a lead article by Leif Johnson, a longtime SDS member and later LC leader. Leif Johnson’s page one article is entitled “The Subway Shell-Game” and it is a very early example of attempts to organize against proposed fare hikes. (Leif Johnson and Steve Komm would make a similar proposal at an SDS regional held at Princeton in 1967.) Leif Johnson is also listed as a member of the editorial board of *19* along with people like Weinstein and Aronowitz.

Yet another future LC member also appears in the pages of this issue of *19*: Tony Chaitkin. For *19*, Chaitkin interviewed two of Weinstein’s rivals, the incumbent Democratic congressman for the 19th Congressional District, Leonard Farbstein, as well as the liberal peace candidate and Democratic City Councilman Ted Weiss who also was running for Congress.

*19* carried an ad for the upcoming Socialist Scholars Conference in New York. After the conference took place; CIPA ran an article on it with a picture of Isaac Deutscher – Trotsky’s famous biographer – addressing the SSC.

Equally interesting, the entire back page of this issue is a cartoon by George Larrabee – whom Carol had married. Larrabee’s cartoon told of the “Revolutionary Adventures of Captain Change.”

Although Weinstein was defeated in the 1966 election, some CIPA groups seem to have remained in place. At least LaRouche's-influenced West Village CIPA did.

Hence we conclude our first installment of the New Mole Files with a leaflet from February 1968 issued by West Village CIPA. It announces a five session seminar on “the revolutionary method in American history.”



For session one examining the early U.S. socialist movement, students were asked to read Theodore Draper's *Roots of American Communism*.

Session Two: World War One and the Russian Revolution. – Students should read Deutscher's *The Prophet Armed*.

Session Three: The rise of Stalinism: Read Theodore Draper's *American Communism and Soviet Russia*.

Session Four: The New Deal and the Rise of Fascism: Read Daniel Guerin's *Fascism and Big Business*.

Session Five on "the current economic and social structure" came with no reading assignment.

The first class began on 23 February 1968 at 65 Morton Street. The instructor was none other than Carol LaRouche although in a foreshadowing of the deletion of Carol's role in the LC's early history, her name was printed as "Corole LaRouche."

## TO BE CONTINUED

---

*Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 06-24-2009 at 11:41 PM.*

## Victory to the NMF!! (New Mole Files)

---

Next up in the New Mole Files is a 11 June 1967 written by one "Lyndon LaRouche, Jr." living on Morton Street to the staff of the *National Guardian* at 197 East 4th Street. The letter was written just at the time of the June 1967 War in the Mideast. LaRouche seems to have hoped that the *National Guardian* would publish it.

I suspect LaRouche dashed off his letter very much in the hopes that it would be published and serve as an incentive for *Guardian* readers to get a copy of the just-published West Village CIPA-pamphlet *The Third Stage of Imperialism* by "L. Marcus." Even though we don't know the exact day the pamphlet hit the streets so to speak, the preface is dated "March 26, 1967." Although I don't have the exact date in front of me, West Village CIPA also took out a small ad in the *National Guardian* announcing its appearance.

LaRouche's long letter argues that the Left was hopelessly confused about the real origins of the war with some on the left cheer-leading the Arabs and others the Israelis. In reality, Egypt attacked due to the fact that it had "a mountain of debt service." Egypt is a capitalist economy. For Nasser to escape economic crisis, he had only two options. The first was to establish a real United Arab Republic so he could get access to oil and in the process drive up oil prices. The second option was to threaten to create such a united Arab state in order to scare the Western imperialists to give him concessions.

Therefore Nasser used a relatively low-grade conflict between Israel and Syria over water rights as a pretext to declare “a phony war” to shake down the West. Israel, however, took advantage of the “phony war” to declare “a real preventive war” against the Arab states.

For years the Arabs have schemed to squeeze out more oil revenue from the West. Yet every time they try, imperialism -- “via the CIA” and related groups -- sets up coups by colonels, sheiks, and “what have you” to overthrow the threatening regime. In response, leaders like Nasser need to create “an Arab Holy Alliance” against the CIA.

Yet when such things happen, “ideologically charged” issues “often far removed” from real material concerns frequently become involved in the equation. So the issue of Israel more or less functions as a pretext for the Arab states to unite ideologically [although if I am reading LaRouche correctly, the really real reason to unite is the extraction of higher oil revenues – HH.] Because of the Israeli oppression of Arabs both inside Israel and out [the Gaza Strip], an oppression which is worse than the way U.S. blacks are treated in cities in the north of the United States, there is a lot of popular resentment against Israel.

Yet the real issue for Nasser isn't the conquest of Israel but rather the need to establish some kind of Arab military confederation into to get access to oil revenue. So Nasser launched his “phony war” and telegraphed his punches and as a result got caught flat-footed in the Israeli blitzkrieg attack.

Now as it so happens, Nasser is one of imperialism's “best successes in this period.” Nasser's Egypt is a national revolutionary capitalist comprador regime and Nasser's Egypt is a “Bonapartist regime.” As such, it is very much close to what “Development Decade” imperialists like. [In other words, they can carry out their controlled modernization policies under such a government – HH.]

But with the 1967 moves by Nasser, he may have gone “too far” for the imperialists. On the other hand, it is also possible that the Israelis acted completely independently.

Therefore, LaRouche concludes his letter that the real question that radical journalists like those in the National Guardian should be trying to answer is to what extent the imperialists sanctioned an Israeli strike because they felt Nasser had gone too far or was it also possible that the Israelis retaliated on their own without being sanctioned by Western Imperialism.

So far, LaRouche concludes, the answer is "not yet clear."

He then signs his letter,

“Fraternally,

L. Marcus.”

As stated earlier, I believe LaRouche -- who used both his real name and pen name in the letter -- wrote the letter in the false hope that its publication would interest *Guardian* readers enough to track down a copy of *The Third Stage of Imperialism*.

And speaking of *Third Stage*, yet another New Mole Files provides the clue as to who designed the striking cover of the original pamphlet. The cover designer is only given as “P. Hipwell.” In this world exclusive to FactNet, it can now be revealed that “P. Hipwell” was actually Phyllis Hipwell, a West Side CIPA member who later abandoned West Village CIPA for West Side CIPA.

---

*Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 06-25-2009 at 09:10 PM.*

### **The New Mole Files Go Down "The Road to Socialism"**

---

One of the more interesting documents discovered in the New Mole Files is entitled “*The Road to Socialism and the Tasks before Us*” co-written by Robert Dillon from “Columbia SDS and West Village CIPA” and Ed Spannaus, “Columbia Social Work School, West Village CIPA, and MDS.”

As for MDS, it stood for the Movement for a Democratic Society --a kind of SDS for grad students. According to Kirkpatrick Sale’s book *SDS* (287), “several staffers at the Columbia School of Social Work actually formed an MDS in the fall of 1965.” Ed Spannaus – who graduated from the Columbia School of Social Work in 1967 – was quite likely a founder of the MDS chapter there.

Two years later in 1969, a group of anti-Labor Committee New Left radicals affiliated with MDS in both New York and San Francisco produced *Leviathan*, a short-lived but important New Left theoretical journal.

*Leviathan* published one of Ted Gold’s last articles before he was killed in the Weatherman Townhouse bombing in New York on West 11th Street on 6 March 1970. The article in the June 1969 issue of *Leviathan* is entitled “Decentralization: Strategy to Reorganize the Cities.” The articles authors are listed as “Mike Josefowicz and Ted Gold . . . organizers and members of TDS (Teachers for a Democratic Society); Beverly Leman, active in community affairs, is an editor of *Leviathan*.”

(The article is noteworthy for its partial acceptance of the Labor Committee/PLP argument that the Ford Foundation’s role in the New York City community control movement was nefarious. For Gold and his co-authors, “decentralization” a la the Ford Foundation/Bundy report was an attempt to manipulate genuine demands for

community control for urban counter-insurgency purposes. The same month the article was published, SDS split at its Chicago convention and the Weatherman/RYM I faction first emerged.)

## THE ROAD INTO SDS

However it is as an early documentation of the proto-LC's involvement in SDS that "*The Road to Socialism*" that is important for our purposes. "*The Road to Socialism*" was first published as a position paper for the 1967 SDS National Convention that met in Ann Arbor, Michigan, from 25 June to 2 July.

The 23 page long document was then reprinted on 12 December 1967. It clearly shows LaRouche's influence and even includes one of the S/V/C "bar diagrams" that LaRouche used in his "Dialectical Economics" classes. As such it predates Leif Johnson's front page article in the 5 February 1968 issue of *New Left Notes* announcing the SDS Transit Project, which as we have already seen, followed Leif Johnson's and Steve's Komm's push for the idea at the SDS Regional Conference held at Princeton in late November 1967.

"*The Road to Socialism*" followed a series of documents developed for New York City organizing in 1966. They include an Ed Spannaus-penned "*Draft Statement for Citywide CIPA*." The most important early document, however, was a call to develop a political "*Second Front against the War in Vietnam*" which involved a "*Proposal for a City Tax on Landlord's Income*." Another Ed Spannaus-authored document from 1967 entitled "*Which Road for Welfare Organizing*" also lists him as a member of West Village CIPA.

This 1967 text follows a 1966 CIPA publication discussed in a critical series of four *New Solidarity* center-fold articles published March 1973 on the history of the Welfare Rights Organization leading up to the formation of the National Unemployed and Welfare Rights Organization (NU-WRO). (All the articles were either written or co-written by Nancy Spannaus.) From the first article of the series:

"Before NWRO was even officially christened, its leaders had been confronted with a devastating critique of their method and with the principles of the only effective organizing strategy for recipients. In a paper distributed at a Welfare Rights Teach-In in New York City in November 1966, the predecessor organization of the Labor Committee (West Village Committee for Independent Political Action) raised, and answered, three crucial questions for the movement: 1) Will it result in adequate welfare benefits?; 2) Where will the new money come from?; and 3) how realistic is the strategy even in its own terms?

"The paper warned that under conditions of the emerging economic crisis, dreams of a guaranteed annual (and adequate) income would soon be punctured. It pointed out the dead-end of a strategy which pits the poor against working people, predicting that in particular, without a class approach to taxation, 'the movement will be forced to accept whatever 'solutions' and concessions' the government had to offer."

This November 1966 document is most likely the “*Political ‘Second Front’ Against the War in Vietnam/Proposal for a City Tax on Landlord’s Incomes.*” As for the Welfare Rights Teach-In, this may be a reference to an 11 November 1966 meeting called by West Village CIPA there the new programmatic document seems to have been distributed.

With the documents from the New Mole Files, we again see the spread of LaRouche’s influence well before the events at Columbia in the spring of 1968. It begins with his first classes at FUNY held sometime in the summer and fall of 1966. The classes, in turn, lead directly to the attempts to establish some kind of programmatic faction inside the still-nascent New York New Left via the formal creation of West Village CIPA sometime presumably in the Fall-Winter of 1966 – most likely sometime in September-October of that year.

### **THE WEST SIDE TENANTS UNION (WSTU)**

Around this time, Ed and Nancy Spannaus were living at 14 West 82nd Street between Central Park West and Amsterdam Avenue. In the summer of 1967, the Spannaus’ and Tom Karp – another Columbia School of Social Work grad who also became a member of the LC -- for a time was the group’s contact man in San Francisco – helped launch the West Side Tenants Union (WSTU), whose headquarters was on 73 West 83rd Street. (Bob Dillon also took an active role as well.)

In his discussion of the origins of the LC -- which I have extensively cited in one of the Old Mole Files -- LaRouche wrote about the now long forgotten Tom Karp: “Karp’s original idea was based on his reading of the history of tenant organizing in New York City, as well as experience he and Spannaus had had while working in the Community Action Program of Local 1199 during 1966-67.”

According to LaRouche, the West Side Tenant Union program proved to be “a significant factor in the development of the Fraser-Papert faction in PLP, and was discussed at considerable length in the first version of *Economism or Socialism*, the Fraser-Papert document presented to PLP.” These developments further led to the creation of a faction with this view in the SDS Transit Project.”

### **ON THE WRONG ROAD SAYS RICK RHOADS**

The role the WSTU played as a “Marcusite project” is also noted in Rick Rhoads article “Len [*sic*] Marcus: Guru of Non-Struggle” in the autumn 1968 issue of PLP’s theoretical magazine *Progressive Labor*. According to Rhoads, “An item in the newsletter of the West Side Tenants Union, a Marcusite group, reads in its entirety, ‘An Interview with City Councilman Ted Weiss’ is also planned for next month. A number of stewards [building reps in the tenants union] volunteered to work on this.” (No. 4, January 1, 1968).” [Note: Anton (Tony) Chaitkin also interviewed Ted Weiss for the 9 September 1966 issue of *19* as we have seen in an earlier NMF post – HH]

Rhoads then comments: “Weiss is a Reform Democrat, elected with the energetic support of the Communist Party, and he is the darling of New York’s ‘left liberals.’ To set up an ‘interview’ between this phony and tenants, while in no way discussing who he is and what he stands for, is the job of reformists, not revolutionaries.” What is most interesting for our purpose, however, is the fact that CIPA-proto-Labor Committee arguments were now entering the Upper West Side by 1967 through the WSTU newsletter.

## **ED SPANNAUS**

As for WSTU co-founder Ed Spannaus, he was born in Seattle in 1943 and later relocated to Chicago in the mid-1950s. His father was reportedly a Lutheran minister with some background in the Left. As for Ed, he entered the Columbia School of Social Work after being active in the Civil Rights movement. Here is an abridged version of Spannaus’ description of his background from <http://www.crmvet.org/vet/spannaus.htm>. [COFO is the Council of Federated Organizations, a civil rights coalition established in 1962 to help organize in Mississippi.]

“COFO, FRIENDS OF SNCC, SNCC -- 1964-65

My first contact with SNCC and the Movement came on a one-week trip to Greenwood, Mississippi in the Spring of 1964, with a group of students from the University of Iowa. We were involved in voter registration . . . . When I returned to Iowa I began recruiting students for the Summer Project, although I did not think I could go myself, for financial reasons. After the disappearance of Cheney-Goodman-Schwerner, I felt I had to go, and my parents arranged a sponsorship from a church human relations group, which enabled me to come to Mississippi in late July. . . . There was a COFO office in Moss Point, and a small group of workers there, and we met regularly with the larger group in Pascagoula and possibly Biloxi also. . . . I worked primarily on voter registration . . . . Once I was there, I wanted to stay after the summer, but the draft and Vietnam loomed large, so I went back to Iowa in mid-September, where I turned the local civil rights group into a Friends of SNCC chapter. . . . In December 1964, I and others in Iowa organized our first demonstration against the war in Vietnam, which we held in a snowstorm at the federal Post Office in Des Moines, Iowa.

In the summer of 1965, I worked part-time with SNCC in Chicago, and spent many evenings at the ongoing, 24-hour a day vigil outside the Chicago Board of Education. . . . I then went to New York, to graduate school at Columbia University, while spending time with SDS, PL, etc. During my second year there, I worked with Local 1199 of the Hospital Workers Union organizing tenants in the South Bronx.

In the fall of 1966, I met Lyndon LaRouche (then known as Lyn Marcus), when a friend took me to his economics class at the Free University of New York. What LaRouche was saying about the need for an economic program as the basis for all social progress made complete sense to me, and I began working with him . . . . “

(Although it is impossible to be sure, Spannaus' friend who took him first to hear LaRouche lecture at FUNY most likely was Bob Dillon, at the time an undergraduate Columbia student majoring in anthropology.)

While Village CIPA worked to develop some kind of programmatic approach to the areas of welfare and tenant issues, there were also attempts to build some kind of city-wide protest against subway fare hikes.

## **LYNDON OUT FOR A CHEAP RIDE**

In the Old Mole Files and related posts, the proto-Labor Committee's attempts to get SDS involved in a coalition against transit fare hikes has been discussed. However one of the New Mole Files includes an announcement from the "Committee to Stop the Fare Increase" which listed its headquarters at 2035-7 Fifth Avenue in New York City. The Chairman of the Committee was Joe Carnegie. He was a black transit worker and the head of the Transit Workers Union Rank and File Committee for a Democratic Union. The Executive Secretary of the Committee to Stop the Fare Increase, however, was none other than "Lyn Marcus." Kim Moody from International Socialists was listed as a Secretary of the group as was Jim Houghton, a long-time Harlem community activist and head of Harlem Fight Back, an organization devoted to securing jobs for black workers on construction sites.

## **ANALYSIS**

The documents in the New Mole Files further underscore the point that the NCLC fundamentally did not truly emerge as an "SDS faction." In fact, the key figures inside the proto-Labor Committee tended to be older members of the New Left whose political activism more came out of the experiences of the "early" SDS but whose real identity first coalesced around LaRouche and West Village CIPA.

Again one reason for the confusion is that – as discussed in the Old Mole Files –the name "SDS Labor Committees" in a way is misleading as the name was only adapted by the LaRouche-allied radicals towards the end of the Columbia Strike and largely because the LaRouche-faction itself played a leading role in a real National SDS-sponsored project known as the Labor Committee of New York SDS. Hence the paper *Solidarity* that was distributed in the New York City garment center carried the subtitle "Published by the Labor Committee of NY SDS." This is also why in his PL article in the autumn of 1968, Rick Rhoads can write: "The N.Y. S.D.S. Labor Committee, presently dominated by Marcusites while most revolutionary forces are involved in the separate summer work-in [that is to say a PLP-SDS sponsored project known as SLAP – Student-Labor Action Project– HH], recently handed out a leaflet in the garment center."

This is also why PL's Jeff Gordon in his October 1968 article for *Progressive Labor* ("SDS: An Analysis") states: "Another proposal was called 'Proposal for Building

Labor Committees.’ It came from the ‘Philadelphia and New York Labor Committees.’ (There are two labor committees in N.Y. ‘The New York Labor Committee’ is one of them.”

Finally in his *Conceptual History of the Labor Committees* ([http://74.125.47.132/search?q=cache:JjnSfTsF0zwJ:www.laroucheplanet.info/pmwiki/pmwiki.php%3Fn%3DLibrary.ConceptualHistoryLC+rhead+s+\"progressive+labor\"+columbia&cd=2&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us](http://74.125.47.132/search?q=cache:JjnSfTsF0zwJ:www.laroucheplanet.info/pmwiki/pmwiki.php%3Fn%3DLibrary.ConceptualHistoryLC+rhead+s+\)), LaRouche also correctly describes the very early Columbia “Labor Committee” as a coalition:

“There were four major developments for this CIPA organization during 1967. The first was the initiative of the Columbia members of the organization in organizing and leading a Winter, 1967 SDS campaign to throw the CIA recruiters off that campus. That incident played an important part in enabling the Labor Committee to propose and lead the Columbia strike of April, 1968. The second was the establishment of the West Side Tenants' Union as a probing of possibility for organizing around the program for housing. The third development was the printing of 3,000 copies of Marcus' *The Third Stage of Imperialism* during the spring of 1967. The fourth development was the cumulative outcome of the first three. The first Labor Committee was formed at Columbia University during **early November, 1967**, as a **coalition** between the CIPA members of Columbia SDS and the majority of the PLP members of that same SDS chapter. [*my emphasis -- HH*]

Since the issuance of the initial mimeographed publication of "Lower West Side CIPA," [*more commonly known as West Village CIPA -- HH*] in October, 1966, the New York PLP student clubs had been in a perpetual state of ferment concerning the conception of socialist program and tactics embedded in that writing. By early Fall of 1967, a handful of Manhattan PLP members working within SDS began to attend secretly Marcus' Free School course. The proposal to SDS to form a support action for the impending January 1, 1968 transit workers' strike gave CIPA and its factional PLP allies in SDS the means for forming the Columbia SDS Labor Committee. They then pushed PLP and others to join them to effect a temporary takeover of New York regional SDS a short time later, around support of the transit workers and defense of the subway fare against proposed increases. [*This was the "SDS Transit Project" -- HH*]

By late January, two developments emerged from the establishment of the Labor Committee. After a couple months, even the thick-headed leadership of national PLP began to realize that they had a potentially powerful socialist faction moving in on their peripheries and membership. A factional struggle erupted between SDS PLPers linked to the national PLP leadership and the CIPA members and their allies. By March, national PLP had lost that fight and withdrew from the Labor Committees. Meanwhile, the Labor Committee faction had moved toward a majority control of Columbia SDS.

While this shift in leadership of Columbia SDS was occurring, there was a scheduled election of chapter officials. The right-wing, anti-labor members of that chapter had 30 supporters, the Labor Committee had 30 supporters, and Mark Rudd and two cronies



stood in the middle. Rudd used his middle position to negotiate the Presidency of the club for himself, and therefore maintained that nominal leadership even after the Labor Committee faction soon became a majority.”

*(To Be Continued)*

---

*Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 06-27-2009 at 08:51 AM.*

### **More Bread Crumbs**

---

Haven't read it but thought the cite was still worth posting:

SPANNAUS, ED AND PAUL GALLAGHER: *Who Pays for Poverty?*  
 Boston: New England Free Press, ca. 1968. 8 1/2 x 11 in. Four-page leaflet.

(The authors, identified here as "community organizers of the West Side Tenants Union," were followers of Lyndon LaRouche. This essay appeared originally in "*Viet-Report*".)

### **FUNY, THE FIFTH INTERNATIONAL, AND THE "LENINIST BOOMERS"**

---

In the summer of 1966 Lyndon LaRouche ("L. Marcus" or "Lyn Marcus" – after leaving the SWP he dropped the second "n" of his SWP party pen name "Lynn Marcus") first began teaching his classes in Marxist Economics at the Free University of New York ("FUNY") on 20 East 14th Street, just off Union Square. FUNY -- two big rooms in a loft that had been divided into five classrooms.

Founded a year earlier in 1965, FUNY opened its doors on Tuesday, 5 July 1966 for its second summer session. Students could attend "Mao for Beginners," "Marxism and American Decadence," "The Russian Revolution in Literature," "History of the Left in the United States," "Perspectives for Revolutionary Change," "Psychoanalysis and Marxism," "Introduction to Marxism," "Elementary Course in Marxist Economics," "Vietnam National Liberation Fronts" and "Theatre against the War in Vietnam."

The FUNY catalog description of a course entitled ELEMENTARY COURSE IN MARXIST ECONOMICS reads: "This course is designed to equip the beginner, with or without previous economic training, with working mastery of the basic method, concepts and practical applications of Marxist economics. The latter part of the course includes a research project by the student on the main features of U. S. economic history, with treatment of the interrelationship between economics and politics in recent U. S. history, including the "Negro Question" and "New Left." Tuesdays at 8:30. L. Marcus."

LaRouche was a tall man with a thick Karl Marx beard and a New England-Brahman accent. (The “bow tie” look would come later.) LaRouche’s classes on Marx were nothing if not original. Along with discussions of *Capital* and the writings of Rosa Luxemburg, LaRouche covered the ideas of the “young Marx” as expressed in works like *The German Ideology* as well as precursor texts such as Feuerbach’s *The Essence of Christianity* and even Hegel’s *Phenomenology of Spirit*.

But LaRouche didn’t just stop there. He incorporated works like Emile Durkheim’s *Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, the mathematical critiques of Kurt Gödel and the psychiatrist Lawrence Kubie’s book *Neurotic Distortions of the Creative Process* – all as part of a course on Marxism. Having spent some 15 years inside the Socialist Workers Party, LaRouche also had a considerable knowledge of the history of both the Left and the labor movement and he had personally known some famous SWP radicals like James Cannon.

LaRouche soon developed a following. An August 1966 HUAC investigation of FUNY supporters, for example, includes the names Anton Chaitkin, Janice Chaitkin, Robert Dillon and Phillis Dillon,” all of whom would later play important roles with LaRouche in the launching first of West Village CIPA and later of the Labor Committee.

When the 23-year old Columbia School of Social Work grad student Ed Spannaus first heard LaRouche lecture at FUNY in the fall 1966 term, LaRouche had just turned 43 years old. His 8 September birthday that year almost exactly coincided with the famous Socialist Scholars Conference held on 9-11 September on the campus of Columbia University. An astonishing 2,000 people showed up at the SSC to hear a list of speakers headlined by an address from Isaac Deutscher, Trotsky’s famed biographer.

Yet just as the New Left was beginning to more seriously investigate the legacy of Marxism in the summer of 1966, LaRouche personally found himself for the first time since 1949 completely separate from any allegiance to any faction or sect inside the highly disorganized world of “organized Trotskyism.”

## **ADVENTURES IN HEALY LAND**

In his pamphlet *What Is Spartacist?*/Bulletin Pamphlet Series 6 (New York: Labor Publications, 1971), Tim Wohlforth gives a brief but detailed snap shot of a critical period in LaRouche’s life from the winter of 1965 when he lost all his ties to the SWP to his first class at FUNY the next summer. Wohlforth and LaRouche first began working together covertly in the summer of 1965 even though LaRouche’s collaboration with Wohlforth’s expelled SWP faction – now called the American Committee for the Fourth International (ACFI) – was a violation of SWP rules.

Exactly when LaRouche left and/or was expelled from the SWP is anyone’s guess. We know he was still technically a member of the party as late as October 1965. This was the month LaRouche drove to Montreal, Canada, and with other ACFI leaders met Gerry Healy.

From *What Is Spartacist?*: “[A]t the Montreal conference which paved the way for the unity negotiations with Spartacist, Marcus was urged to remain as long as possible in the SWP and carry on serious work seeking to continue the struggle for political clarification the SWP had sought to break off with the split from the [Healy-run] IC and the expulsion of our tendency.” Wohlforth continues: “Marcus resisted this and in the end simply pulled out of the SWP without a serious struggle. He also refused to keep the struggle inside the SWP on a principled level sinking into personal analyses and attacks on sections of the leadership.”

In the first volume of his book *The Party*, long-time SWP leader Barry Sheppard writes about LaRouche: “He was expelled by the New York branch for being a member of Tim Wohlforth’s Workers League . . . . Prior to his expulsion, I discussed this charge with LaRouche and he admitted being a member of the Workers League [actually the ACFI – HH]. The expulsion seemed to be basically okay with him.” In his article on LaRouche for the 29 October-4 November 1986 issue of *In These Times*, Wohlforth recalled: “After the September party conference [of the SWP – HH], LaRouche and his new wife Carol left the SWP and joined our small group. For about six months thereafter I met with LaRouche almost every day.”

During this period, LaRouche treated Wohlforth to his economic ideas that would later surface in *Third Stage of Imperialism*. Again from Wohlforth’s *In These Times* article: “The LaRouche group’s polemics became increasingly strident and directed against liberals. Of course, liberal-bashing was quite popular in left student circles during those days, and LaRouche excelled at it. I remember private discussions I had with him in 1965 when he expounded on Kennedy, Rockefeller, and the Trilateral Commission.” [Unless LaRouche really was a genius, Wohlforth clearly meant to say something like the Council on Foreign Relations as the Trilateral Commission wasn’t organized till the early 1970s – HH.]

Wohlforth continued: “LaRouche believed that there was a network of foundations and agents of the more moderate, internationalist Eastern capitalists who sought to avoid unrest at home through reform projects and revolutions abroad through development programs like the Alliance for Progress. Even as a radical, LaRouche believed liberals were the main enemy.”

As for LaRouche, he records his approximately seven month long escapade in the ACFI in *How the Workers League Decayed*. Here he said his link to the ACFI first began this way: “The first issue of the *Bulletin*, distributed particularly to all known SWP oppositionists, included a supplement setting forth a fair vulgarization of the economic aspect of my 1958 these. In response to this, Carol and I contacted Fred Mueller and began discussions with the Wohlforth group.” He then states that “From February, until at least mid-August 1966, there was no question of my hegemony in the [ACFI] group on political questions.”

## **A TROTSKYIST TRIFFINITE IN THE ACFI (OR “THE TROUBLE WITH TRIFFINS”?)**

Whatever the exact date for LaRouche's expulsion from the SWP, by December 1965 he was writing articles for the ACFI's *Bulletin of International Socialism*. (I have only been able to track down a few issues from volume two when LaRouche was an ACFI member – HH.)

In the 27 December 1965 issue of the *Bulletin* (Vol. 2, No. 22), there appears an article clearly written by LaRouche entitled "Bankers Slap Down LBJ: The Federal Reserve's Action and the Vietnam War Economy." It warns of a potential crisis in the U.S. economy: "Further, European and Japanese holders of dollars and claims against dollars are impelled to trade these claims into gold instead of U.S. goods! Such a development threatens to bring about a devaluation of the U.S. dollar and an ensuing worldwide collapse far more devastating than that of 1929-31. The rise in U.S. interest rates does tend to ameliorate this threat. By pegging U.S. interest rates at a high level, foreign dollar holders are induced to invest their claims in U.S. government bonds and other paper instead of demanding immediate settlement in gold. This, again, only postpones the problem . . . ."

LaRouche's analysis of the impending dollar crisis – while unusual – was by no means unique to him. Other "left economists" writing in journals like *The Minority of One* also warned that the U.S. was facing a coming monetary crisis. As for LaRouche, he openly drew on the work of the Belgian-born economist Robert Triffin, who taught at Yale. In 1960, Triffin wrote about the coming crisis in his book *Gold and the Dollar Crisis: The Future of Convertibility*. LaRouche cites Triffin's work in "The Coming American Socialist Revolution" which he co-wrote with Carol. (Their document was published in the *SWP Discussion Bulletin* (Vol. 25, No. 6) as a pre-convention document for the SWP's 1965 gathering. As for Triffin, see [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert\\_Triffin](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert_Triffin) and [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Triffin\\_dilemma](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Triffin_dilemma).)

### "TAX LANDLORDS, NOT PEOPLE!"

Perhaps one of the most important articles LaRouche wrote during his ACFI sojourn appeared in the 14 February 1966 issue of the *Bulletin* under the title "Tax Landlords, Not People! An Alternative to Lindsay's Anti-Labor Program." In it, LaRouche writes: "From Wall Street's point of view, New York City is merely a money-farm, its people so much livestock, to be milked, shorn and flayed to the limits of long-suffering popular endurance."

Yet what is most striking is the article's attempt to translate LaRouche's grand economic ideas into programmatic actions over tax policy which he sees as key to future radical organizing in an urban setting: "This is not a proposal to establish 'socialism in one city.' This is the kind of demand a united city labor movement, with the support of students, minorities and middle-income people, can advance on the same basis as a trade-union struggle with an employer over wages and working conditions. It is also more than a trade-union struggle. A united ad hoc organization of trade unionists, students, and

middle-income people on such a vital issue is, in practice, a ‘shadow’ city government, a potential Labor party.”

It was just this “practical” attempt that Wohlforth later mocked in his “Many Theories of L. Marcus” article published in the *Bulletin* on 16 December, 1968 (Vol. 5, No. 8-9), Here Wohlforth comments that after LaRouche left the formal Trotskyist movement in the summer of 1966, “he happily threw himself into the construction of a student intellectual circle which transforms the Transitional Program into liberal reformist tax proposals, denies Leninism on the question of the party, and refuses at any time to assess historically the question of the Fourth International.”

### **JAMES ROBERTSON BEGS TO DIFFER**

During their ACFI alliance, Wohlforth and LaRouche worked with Gerry Healy in England to forge a merger with James Robertson’s numerically far larger American-based Spartacist faction, which had left the SWP earlier than the Wohlforth. The negotiations ended after Robertson flew to London for an April 1966 “Unity Conference” with Healy that turned into a total debacle. At the meeting, Healy proceeded to act like a seeming lunatic and he even demanded that Robertson publicly denounce himself. (See Robertson’s statement in <http://www.bolshevik.org/history/ICL...20Smashed.html>.)

The final crackup between the Healy/ACFI and Robertson’s Spartacist grouping followed months of negotiations between the two tiny sects. As a leading ACFI member with his main portfolio being economics, LaRouche took part in some of the talks. In the Spartacist League publication *Conversations with Wohlforth* (Marxist Bulletin, No. 3), LaRouche’s comments from a unification meeting held on 23 September 1965 were taken down. (In the transcript, LaRouche is listed just as “L.”)

“L. – Their solution (i.e., the capitalists) is to attempt to establish a viable and productive peasantry in the backward countries and lay the basis for primitive accumulation to create an internal market and lay the basis for capitalist expansion. Since 1959, the U.S. has followed a policy of managed social revolutions; the general policy of imperialism is to support nationalist colonial revolution as long as they remain within control of imperialism.”

LaRouche later continued: “The SWP et al. failed to see this and merely sees the U.S. and its allies as conducting a struggle against the colonial revolution . . . this is not the case. They are instead trying to circumvent the Permanent Revolution by sucking the working class and peasantry of these countries into the train of Ben Bella, Nasser, etc. and to use these regimes to lay the basis for reorganization for healthy internal agricultural development, and in turn the imperialist exploitation of these countries. Pabloites see this as progressive. If colonial revolution follows the Cuban/Ben Bella model, ultimately it is the victory of imperialism.”

During the same meeting, LaRouche later says: “How does capitalism progress – by expanding production. But this has come to a halt in the advanced countries, and they

expand instead in Latin America, in Africa, in India. We saw this in 1957 in Cuba, how consciously the bourgeoisie supported the Castro revolution. The only solution is to create a prosperous and productive peasantry and create an internal market for capitalist accumulation; otherwise it will have to confront class struggle in its own country in the last resort.”

*Conversations with Wohlforth* also contains a discussion of LaRouche’s key SWP internal document, “*The Coming American Socialist Revolution*” which is a rough draft of his entire programmatic and philosophical approach later developed in the NCLC. He clearly showed it to Robertson before the SWP convention began because Robertson’s comments are dated 5 August 1965. After reading the document, Robertson commented: “The document has a very peculiar quality indeed. The SWP leadership will be riled by it and be able to rip it to pieces. The summary is interesting, but basically it is a right-wing and objective document.”

On 23 September 1965, another member of the Robertson faction -- “Nelson” – remarked: “The L. document might be characterized as left Freudian. If I wanted to be quite blunt, I would say it had a crackpot quality. . . . Comrades of the ACFI, if you are 99% in agreement with this document, as you stated before, then you are in bad shape.”

Robertson also returned to the LaRouche SWP paper at that same gathering: “On the L. document, I’m afraid I must confess that I too have not understood a word of Marx, Engels, Lenin or Trotsky if this is the ABC of Marxism. In fact, in rereading the document I thought of a cartoon that is a favorite of mine. Several workmen have just unwrapped a very large canvas and the art dealers are looking at it. In the middle of the large white canvas is a perfect black dot. And one of the art dealers is saying to the other one, ‘I don’t care if he is the world’s greatest painter, I still think he is kidding.’ – This is the quality I carried away from reading the L. document. As to whether the aim of the bourgeoisie in the colonial world is to create a prosperous peasantry in order to find a new base for exploitation – I don’t even want to deal with this. That is a very original contribution indeed!”

### **“WHILE WOHLFORTH WALKED ALONG THE PATH OF LENINISM”: LAROUCHE’S BREAK WITH THE ACFI**

As we have seen, the negotiations between the Wohlforth ACFI and the Spartacist faction continued up until the disastrous final encounter between Robertson and Healy in London in April 1966. The collapse of the London talks also proved decisive in LaRouche’s decision to abandon the Healy-dominated ACFI and ally with Robertson. Writing in the June-July issue of *Spartacist*, Robertson reported: “Now, since Wohlforth first called fusion off in an outburst at the March 20 [1966] joint meeting, over a quarter of ACFI’s nearly 40 members has dropped from the organization or joined with L. Marcus and Carol Lawrence in carrying out fusion with Spartacist.” In *What is Spartacist?* Tim Wohlforth also recalls: “the first major explosion with Marcus came on the eve of the April 1966 Conference when ACFI was forced to reject Robertson’s draft

document as a basis for an American resolution to submit to the conference.”

Robertson’s draft appears to have been submitted some time before the 20 March conclave because Wohlforth then says that LaRouche was “commissioned to work up an alternate draft for ACFI.” However LaRouche’s draft as well as Robertson’s “was not found acceptable by the Coordinating Committee of the ACFI either.” (Wohlforth’s formal rejection of LaRouche’s alternate draft for unification, “Some Comments on Perspectives for the Fused Movement Submitted by Tim Wohlforth,” is dated 3 March 1966 and is quoted in *What is Spartacist?*)

With the rejection of both Robertson and LaRouche’s proposed unification documents and the collapse of the Robertson-Healy talks highlighted by Healy’s crude attempts to humiliate Robertson in public, it was now clear that the ACFI was to be exclusively a Gerry Healy franchise.

Seeing the handwriting on the wall, LaRouche and Carol issued a resignation letter from the ACFI dated 9 May 1966.

LaRouche made it clear that his main reason for leaving the ACFI was the thuggish role that Healy played in the movement. In *What Is Spartacist?*, Wohlforth quotes LaRouche as writing: “At the London Conference and in its sequel it became clear that the continued political hegemony of the SLL [Healy’s Socialist Labour League – HH] had become a decisive obstacle to the founding of a new international and an American Trotskyist movement at this juncture.”

Wohlforth comments: “Marcus made no bones about it. He was breaking from the IC because of Healy’s supposed organizational practices and not because of any political differences.” In *What Is Spartacist?*, Wohlforth gives a long quote from a 17 April 1967 LaRouche polemic entitled “*What Makes Tim Wohlforth Run?*” that seems to have been inspired by the rejection of LaRouche’s alternate reunification document. Wohlforth also cites an extremely long series of quotes from a 3 May 1966 letter from Gerry Healy to LaRouche following the collapse of the London talks. LaRouche and Carol resigned almost immediately after receiving Healy’s letter.

In his 9 May Resignation Statement, LaRouche begins: “While Wohlforth walked along the path of Leninism we walked with him. For that we have no regrets.” It concluded: “We carry out the historic task of fusion with the Spartacist League.”

## **CONFRONTATION WITH SHANE MAGE/SPLIT WITH ROBERTSON**

LaRouche’s “historic task” of fusion with Robertson lasted seven weeks.

At first all seemed to go well. LaRouche had a front page article in the then-bi-monthly June-July 1966 issue *Spartacist* (“Battle for Asia”) while Carol became Managing Editor. An editorial in that same issue proclaimed that the ACFI was on the ropes with the collapse of the London talks even as Wohlforth’s position inside the ACFI “was

aggravated by the latter's political break with the ACFI's proclaimed theoretical leader, L. Marcus, at the same time."

Yet the Robertson-LaRouche alliance was built on sand. First, LaRouche had spent some months trying to organize the ACFI out from under Gerry Healy's control. In so doing, he began to increasingly envision implementing his own ideas for a new kind of radical party, ideas originally outlined in his series of internal documents he first put forward before the SWP September 1965 National Conference. (Besides *The Coming American Revolution* and its long epilogue, "Cannonism in Perspective," the texts include "The Fragmentation of World Trotskyism" (*SWP Internal Discussion Bulletin* Vol. 25, No. 14) written on 9 August 1965 and "Economics and Politics" – written on 27 July 1965.)

LaRouche triumphs the idea that the new revolutionary party must be led by the "revolutionary intelligentsia," He returned to this theme once again in his ACFI Resignation Statement: "A party not led by the a leading layer of the revolutionary intelligentsia can not be a revolutionary party, can not conduct the struggle for ideological hegemony which is the absolute precondition for a socialist transformation. A party which lacks such a leading layer can neither lead the working class and its allies to power, except under the most extraordinary favorable circumstances, and is incapable of producing a 'Left Opposition' to maintain the continuity of Leninism during periods in which the 'proletarian kernel' of the movement defects to centrism." (Source: *Bulletin of International Socialism*, Aug.-Sept. 1966. Part two of a series entitled "Spartacist and the Intellectual in Retreat.")

By July 1966, LaRouche and Robertson locked horns in a bitter fight ostensibly over economics. In the early unity sessions dating back to the fall of 1965 whose minutes are documented in the Spartacist League's "*Conversations with Wohlforth*," the LaRouche-ACFI theory about an impending capitalist crisis came under repeated sharp attack from Shane Mage, a member of the Spartacist tendency as well as the leading economist in the SWP opposition.

Unlike LaRouche, Mage was a professionally trained economist. His 1963 PhD thesis from the department of economics at Columbia University was entitled "The Law of the Falling Tendency of the Rate of Profit: Its Place in the Marxian Theoretical System and Relevance to the United States"? He then became an Assistant Professor of Economics at the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn.

In the August-September 1966 issue of the ACFI's *Bulletin*, it was recalled that Mage "was brought into the joint unity discussions" by Robertson in the winter of 1965. "At this session" of the talks when Mage was present, he "launched into a major attack on the economic perspective of ACFI expressing his full confidence in the ability of capitalism to survive without serious economic crisis. Mage saw, instead, that the struggles of the future would occur despite this prosperity because of the alienation of man brought about by the meaningless of it all. Robertson and other representatives of Spartacist at this session supported Mage's economic position."



Fully embracing the New Left line, Mage soon began arguing that the “working class was no longer a meaningful revolutionary force in the modern world. The Spartacist organization then asked Mage to resign which he promptly did.” (Mage also wound up teaching a class at FUNY during the same summer that LaRouche began teaching there.)

Even with Mage gone, it was clear that James Robertson was not about to turn over the Spartacist grouping to LaRouche’s own brand of economics, which – in turn – was intimately linked to LaRouche’s broader “political perspectives” for the future achievement of socialism.

LaRouche first FUNY class took place on or around 5 July 1966. He clearly saw the class as part of a new effort linked to cadre recruitment; cadre who would agree with his own “line.” Robertson clearly had no desire to let LaRouche develop his own clique of followers that would undermine his own leadership.

From Tim Wohlforth’s *What Is Spartacist?*: “By July [LaRouche and Robertson] were embroiled in a new faction fight as Marcus had discovered that while he shared in common with Robertson his hatred of the International Committee, he had nothing else in common politically. Robertson rejected out of hand Marcus’s assessment of the international crisis and even denied that questions of the economy were of importance to the development of the party and its perspective.” In response, LaRouche penned “*The Question of Marxist Economics*” on 14 July 1966, just as his first FUNY adventure was getting underway.

Challenging Robertson, LaRouche wrote: “Members of the Resident Editorial Board have stated positions which cater to anti-theoretical, anti-Marxist sentiments pressing against our ranks from petty bourgeois ideology. . . It has been stated, in support of those attacks, that Marxist economics is by no means essential to the seizure or holding of state power by the workers’ movement. That rationale in itself constitutes a cardinal principle of anti-Marxism. . . . How can an organization call itself Marxist, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, reject as unimportant that theory to which Marx and Engels devoted their life’s effort? How can an organization term itself Leninist, and deny the cardinal principle of Leninism, that ‘Without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement?’”

## **BUILDING THE FIFTH INTERNATIONAL WITH THE “LENINIST BOOMERS”**

About a week after writing his response to Robertson, LaRouche and Carol resigned from the Spartacist League. On 24 July 1966, LaRouche announced his resignation in a letter that was sent to the ACFI’s *Bulletin*. In it, LaRouche proclaimed: “The tragic fact is that the 4th International has been destroyed by various currents of revisionism within it, Healy’s included; the task now is to begin those urgent steps toward building a 5th!” He would do so quite literally with “Leninist boomers.”

In the Epilogue: “Cannonism in Perspective” from “The Coming American Socialist Revolution,” LaRouche writes on page xv-xvi: “In this period of rising radical ferment among youth and minorities, in a reawakening of the pre-stages, in the form of rank and file ferment, of left-wing tendencies in the trade unions, our first task is to train a cadre of organizers, of **Leninist ‘boomers,’** who can take to the boondocks of U.S. society to explain the current economic situation, to present the strategic world and national prospects for socialism, to penetrate every facet of radical ferment in student, minority and working-class movements.” [My emphasis -- HH]

When the 23-year old Ed Spannaus showed up at FUNY in the fall of 1966 could he ever have imaged that he would spend the next 43 years of his life “in the boondocks of U.S. society” continually toiling away as a loyal “Leninist ‘boomer” intent on constructing Lyndon LaRouche’s ever-changing fantasy “Fifth International”?

**CODA:** In the midst of Rick Rhoads “Len Marcus: Guru of Non-Struggle” in *Progressive Labor* in the autumn of 1968, there is a one-page insert by Roger Taus identified as being from “Columbia PLP and SDS.”

Taus’s article (“Len Marcus: Marxist or Scab?”) begins: “L. Marcus holds the dubious distinction of being the Columbia Liberation school’s first ‘professor.’ When 730 students were released from jail after holding five buildings at Columbia for seven days, Marcus began a series of ‘liberated’ classes which lasted throughout the strike and into the formal ‘liberation’ school following the strike. . . . Marcusite Bob Dillon was the leading organizer of these classes. The Marcusites, along with the advocates of the ‘new working class’ and Debrayist line, pushed liberated classes, not as an educational adjunct to the strike but as a substitute for involving thousands of students in a real strike.”

In other words: LaRouche and Bob Dillon incredibly managed to import LaRouche’s FUNY “Marxism 101” class right into the heart of the 1968 Columbia Strike!

*(With this post, we end part one of the New Mole Files. It is hoped that the NMF – combined with the Old Mole Files posted earlier – have helped illuminate -- at least in part -- the rather opaque “pre-history” of the Labor Committee from LaRouche’s last days in the SWP through the ACFI and Spartacist League and FUNY to the network of groupings centered around West Village CIPA. We have also traced how LaRouche and his early collaborators entered into the broader world of SDS and by so doing helped win over some key members of Columbia SDS chapter at Columbia who would later play critical roles in the Columbia strike. In Part 2, we bring the NMF project to completion and in so doing enter the not-so-nice world of the late 1960s. Some of our files “pack a powerful punch” and may even give new meaning to the term “the swinging sixties.”)*

**RESEARCH NOTE:** For a brief description of FUNY, see Edward Grossman, “New York’s Schoolhouse for the Left,” in the April 1966 issue of *Harper’s*. For a detailed look at FUNY, see the *INVESTIGATIVE HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON UN-*

AMERICAN ACTIVITIES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES EIGHTY-NINTH  
CONGRESS SECOND SESSION AUGUST 16-19, 1966 and available on the web.

---

Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 06-29-2009 at 10:47 AM.

### **The nmf half-time show: On knowing what we don't know**

---

Part one of the New Mole Files (NMF) traced the emergence of the Labor Committee from LaRouche's 1965 series of SWP internal discussion papers through the ACFI, Spartacist League, FUNY, West Village CIPA, SDS, the WSTU and ultimately onto the campus of Columbia University in the months before the strike.

[And speaking of these early days: A useful text is Stanley Aronowitz's memoir, "When the New Left Was New" first published in *Social Text*, 9/10 (Spring-Summer 1984). And a big tip of the hat to the research wizard who provides this remarkable reference: "Spannaus, Ed, "The Welfare Rights Movement and the Guaranteed Annual Income," *The Braille Monitor* (Ink print ed.), April 1968, pp. 957-962 (reprinted from *\_GAIN\_*, Jan. 1968)."]

Part two of the NMF will complete once and for all the examination of the early origins of the NCLC. Although the most interesting section is the period surrounding the group's activities in New York from the fall of 1968 into 1969, reference will also be made to a few of the events surrounding Operation Mop-Up. More specifically, I will show that the reference in the Old Mole Files to the *Spartacist* paper leaking internal NCLC "Beyond Psychoanalysis" documents during the midst of Operation Mop-Up was correct. I will give the citations for their publication as well as the Spartacist take on the organization since we now know that the Spartacist leadership in New York was well acquainted with LaRouche personally.

### **THE RETURN OF THE BAVARIANS**

In this introduction to part two of the NMF, I think it is useful to list some of the questions and areas of research that I have no ability to examine and that will remain unanswered. The most important unanswered question, by far, is the emergence of the "Bavarian tendency" under Steve Fraser.

As suggested by the Old Mole Files and other postings, there is something just plain weird about the faction fight. I think at the deepest level the reason the debate seems so strange may be ascribed to the fact that by 1969-1970 it still was not at all clear just what the Labor Committee really was. To the Trotskyist Left, the Labor Committee was seen largely as a kind of technocratic take on social democracy. But it seems fairly evident that the LC hadn't yet coalesced into any one fixed organizational "mold" but still represented a grouping very much in flux.

In 1975 former NCLC member Dan Jacobs wrote the first major study of the NCLC ("A

True History of Lyn Marcus [Lyndon LaRouche] and the Labor Committees”). Although it was published in kooky Fred Newman’s journal *Critical Practice*, Jacobs pulled together a serious study of the group from a partisan leftist perspective. Discussing the “Bavarians,” Jacobs states:

“With the ebb and flow in the student movement highlighted by the crack-up of SDS in the summer of 1969, the Labor Committee went through an identity crisis from which it was never successfully to emerge. A factional crevice began developing (especially in New York) over the basic question of what kinds of activity were appropriate for the young organization in the new period. One group composed of younger college recruits from the Columbia and CCNY campuses – many of them former PLP members (Papert, Sober, Hecht, Milkman et al.) -- placed heavy emphasis on active, programmatic intervention into the more burning political issues facing New York’s population (e.g., open admissions and the State Office Building [S.O.B.] pork barrel), and were constantly sniffing out upcoming “mass strikes” that would both revive the student movement and facilitate a massive united front socialist intervention.

“The other group, led by the ‘seasoned’ members out of West Village CIPA (Marcus, Johnson, Ed and Nancy Spannaus et al.) emphasized cadre development and theoretical consolidation (concentrating on ‘Marxist philosophy’), urging mainly propaganda interventions to build up the Labor Committee membership, as well as organizational centralization to get beyond the loosely federated situation that prevailed with the various locals.”

As the super-activists burnt themselves out super-activating and the theoreticians theorized, Jacobs continues: “A weird factional situation began crystallizing at the January 1970 national conference when Papert and Steve Fraser, a leading Philadelphia member and former PLP comrade of Papert’s, delivered their National Report proposing a tactic on the LC’s orientation toward the emerging popular-front ecology movement in the U.S. Papert read the report, which had not been previously distributed to the confused membership, at a rapid-fire clip. The report was sharply criticized by Marcus and Co. for opportunistically pandering to scientists, engineers, etc. who would be participating in the ecology movement, and for essentially proposing that the LC dissolve itself into the ecology movement.”

The conference that Jacobs referred to took place on 4 January 1970 at the Beacon Hotel in New York. Apparently the idea of the LC entering into the ecology movement (“a French turn”?) seems linked to another project that sounds equally strange. In December 1969 the LC put forward a proposal apparently to the rest of the American Left for the establishment of a new “national paper” that would presumably replace the National Guardian, which had fallen apart during a series of bitter internal struggles. (By mid-January 1970. there were actually two rival versions of the Guardian being published, The Guardian and The Liberated Guardian.) The proposal for a nationwide paper was co-signed by Martha Levittan (later of the SLC) in New York and Phil Rubenstein, then living in Seattle.

From the conference aftermath, there emerged a truly hard-to-comprehend faction fight that lasted basically a year! As Jacobs puts it: “Even for a patient historian of the movement, it is all but impossible to slosh through the arguments, counter-arguments, cross-fire allegations, lies, distortions, and evasions hurled up on both sides of this debacle and make some sense of it all.” At least one part of the debate seems to have gone to the core of what the LC should be since Jacobs reports that LaRouche attacked the Frasier group’s “‘ultra-democratic,’ anti-centralization bias, which saw them resisting the transition of the Labor Committee from a federation of autonomous local chapters to a national cadre organization.”

Clearly then, the fact that the NCLC spent almost an entire year crippled in a largely incomprehensible factional dispute holds great relevance to the organization’s history. However it is a saga that remains beyond this author’s grasp.

### **WE HAVE FILES . . .**

Equally important for anyone interested in tracing the history of the NCLC has to be the thousands of pages of declassified government files that now exist regarding the group’s history. The FBI files run into thousands of pages by now. The FBI files – and related local FBI and police intelligence files in key cities such as New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore – would be very important for any serious history of the organization.

### **PLP**

Yet another untold story is the spread of the NCLC not just into Columbia but into the main campus of CCNY (still then the “Jewish Harvard”). While quite a lot is known about the NCLC’s role at Columbia, almost nothing is known about the group’s activities at CCNY. (Later one would also have to look at other campuses such as Rutgers, Queens College, and Stony Brook.) Another massive blank chapter in the early origins of the NCLC intimately linked to its early development both in New York and Philadelphia is the way the “second wave” of the NCLC emerged from the orbit of the Progressive Labor Party (PLP).

PLP was beyond any doubt one of the most influential organizations inside the American Left in the 1960s. Much hated by the “new working class,” “counter-culture” and National Office SDS leadership, PLP nonetheless played a remarkable role in the saga of the Left in the 1960s even though it is almost completely ignored in writings about the New Left today.

With the Labor Committee in general, and both New York and Philadelphia in particular, some key members of PLP left it to join the LC. Equally worthy of note, some of the ideas held by PLP also show up in the early Labor Committee.

For our purposes, one of the most important ideas is the notion that “local control” with regard to the New York school system was a kind of “counter-insurgency” doctrine

developed by ruling class institutions like the Ford Foundation to deliberately divide the working class along racial lines.

[Unfortunately there is to this day no real study of the history of PL even though there is one book on PL in the New York garment center (Leigh Benin's *The New Labor Radicalism*). But the larger history of PL remains unwritten as its presence has been virtually blanked out of academic writings on the New Left. So the project to place the emergence of the second wave of LC recruits from the New York branch of PL (and the Fraser-Papert group in particular) is yet to be written.]

### **UP AGAINST THE BLACKBOARD WALL: FROM THE PROTO-WEATHERMAN TO THE NEW WORKING CLASS**

Also virtually unwritten is the history of the pre-Weatherman Rudd faction in New York SDS as well as the way it was influenced by the anarchists. Recently however, Osha Neumann's memoir *Up Against the Wall Motherf\*\*ker* has been published and a few articles on Ben Morea – the leader of UAW/MF – have surfaced as well. But, again, much of the history of the anarchists and Rudd grouping has not been documented.

Finally, to understand the NCLC in the prism of the New Left, one must also understand the “new working class” debates inside SDS, a polemic that greatly engaged the early NCLC. Some years ago (former SDS national leader) Greg Calvert and Carol Neiman published *A Disrupted History: The New Left and the New Capitalism* that provides an overview of this tendency's ideas. However the way the “new working class” line was promoted in New York (including by David Gilbert) remains largely off the radar screen even though it consumed a lot of the early polemical writings of the LC.

These then are just some of the issues that any historian of the period would have to take into account. The LC's polemics also emerged in part out of a seemingly endless series of debates held between the different factions at the Columbia Liberation School in the late spring and summer of 1968 in the wake of the Columbia Strike and they reflect one of the many currents inside the New York New Left.

### **THE TEACHERS STRIKE**

Yet in a way far more important to the understanding of the LC in this early period in New York has to be the epochal New York City Teachers' Strike. In the fall of 1968, the AFT strike against community control further inflamed tensions between the black and Jewish community in particular. The fact that the Labor Committee was almost unique in offering critical support to the teachers union will be referred to in the New Mole Files. But what can't be recreated is the incredible sense of crisis and feeling of a potential impending race war that ran through New York that fall. In November of that same year, Richard Nixon was elected President.

Meanwhile inside the New Left in general, political arguments were turning more and more into shouting matches and fist fights as the concept of the “beloved community”

went up in smoke. Ultimately these divisions would culminate in the disastrous SDS National Convention in Chicago in the summer of 1969. So we are talking about a dark time when the first feelings of discovering a new world that fueled the rise of the New York New Left from 1965 to Columbia '68 had begun to ebb as it now seemed as if the war in Vietnam would never end.

So these are just a few of the issues and problems that anyone wanting to study the early history of the NCLC would have to address. I, however, only want to mention them here precisely because the New Mole Files can't wrestle with any of them in any serious fashion and won't try. Again, the purpose of the NMF is to put some historical bread crumbs into the electronic ether so that anyone interested in pursuing further research will not have to start the search from square one.

With all that in mind, let us now complete part two of the New Mole Files and in so doing bring our twisting shambolic ramble through the early history of the NCLC to an end.

---

*Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 07-01-2009 at 11:04 AM.*

### **“HO HO HO CHI MIHN! THE NMF IS GONNA WIN!”: Up Against the Ivy Wall with the New Mole Files!**

---

In May 1968 the Progressive Labor Party withdrew its support from the SDS Transit Project. That same month, “the National Caucus of SDS Labor Committees” -- which included the SDS Labor Committees in New York City and Philadelphia -- first emerged as an independent self-identified SDS “tendency.” The New York group would publish *Solidarity*, first issued a few months later by the “Labor Committee of the New York Students for a Democratic Society.” It would also put out the first truly “Labor Committee-run” issue of the *Campaigner*. [See **NOTE TWO** below.]

At the very end of May 1968, the “Fraser-Papert faction” of PLP tried to present its program at a PL convention. A few days later Papert was officially expelled from PL. With Papert went 10 to 15 members of the Fraser-Papert grouping in New York City and Philadelphia. Then a few days later on 9 June, Labor Committee members such as Paul Milkman were among the over 800 people who had arrived for a week-long SDS National Convention held in Lansing, Michigan, at Michigan State. On paper, SDS seemed to be almost unstoppable with the National Convention coming right after the Columbia strike.

In reality, SDS was sinking deeper and deeper into chaos.

### **THE EAST LANSING SDS CONVENTION**

A key PL/SDS activist named Jeff Gordon also attended the meeting and later reported on it in the October 1968 issue of *Progressive Labor*. In an article entitled “SDS: An

Analysis,” Gordon took note of the newly named Labor Committee writing: “Another proposal was called ‘Proposal for Building Labor Committees.’ It came from the ‘Philadelphia and New York Labor Committees.’ (There are two labor committees in N.Y. ‘The New York Labor Committee is one of them.)”

The full text of the SDS Labor Committee proposal was published in the 24 June 1968 edition of *New Left Notes*. The document begins: “SDS should encourage the formation throughout the country of committees through which radicals can work with and propagandize workers and poor people. . . . We are not suggesting that organizing and propagandizing among students, black people, and the unorganized and the most oppressed should be de-emphasized; it is at this point still the most important aspect of our activity. . . . But at some point soon, the mass actions of these people must begin to find support among the increasingly discontented white workers, even be joined by them.”

After a section critiquing local control struggles both in communities and the workplace – a seeming critique of SDS attempts to organize Newark on the one hand and PL’s emphasis on factory colonization on the other – the proposal continues: “The following are lines of action (general and specific) with this aim which the New York-Philadelphia Labor Committees have begun and will continue this summer. We recommend things of this nature as the activity of other labor committees formed; we do not suggest them as ready-made projects. The issues and actions effective in each city and each situation can only be determined by research and experience.”

The proposal then outlines the Labor Committee role in leafleting around 1) the transit hikes in New York City; 2) leafleting and rallies in the New York garment center; 3) the role of the Columbia Liberation School as a forum to debate ideas; 4) ongoing “research – with special attention to up-coming strikes, housing campaigns, et cetera”; and 5) support for strikes among both striking workers and the community, propagandizing about the potential links between interests of striking workers and those of other groups within the community.”

The proposal concluded by endorsing “the implementation section” of the PL-sponsored Student Labor Action Project (SLAP) “with the following addition: 1) the editorial policy of the proposed newsletter be absolutely non-exclusive with respect to contributions from committees so as to encourage development of revolutionary ideas” since “at this stage of our movement, nobody has all the answers”; and 2) the coordinating office of the proposed labor committees “be in New York, where the continuing effects of the Columbia strike provide the ideal conditions for the works of student-labor committees.”

In his article Gordon gave PL’s answer, claiming that the proposal “attacks the growing on-the-job militancy of millions of workers. (On this they [the Labor Committees] see eye-to-eye with the ‘new working class’ people.” Gordon claimed that by opposing factory colonization, the proposal would “attack and try to discourage workers from fighting on the job against the boss. This is the kind of worker-student misalliance the boss would support.”



Gordon continues: “Workers are powerful when they fight at the point of production – where they can stop production. . . . This proposal [the SDS Labor Committee] takes a classical ‘economist’ position, holding that the major thing students can bring to workers is economic expertise” and claims to show workers that they [the Labor Committee] know how to run the system “better” than the bosses so that the workers will say “‘If that’s socialism, then I’m a socialist.’” Gordon then adds sarcastically “(Easy, huh!)”

## **PL GETS SLAPPED DOWN**

The Labor Committee draft -- as well as proposals from PL and one or two other groupings -- were never officially approved at East Lansing. According to Gordon, the SDS National Office (NO) and “New Working Class” (NWC) groupings deliberately placed any debate about them near the end of the week-long agenda knowing that there would not be enough time for them to be heard. Yet the NO/NWC caucus couldn’t present the formation of workshops around these ideas and the Convention agreed that the proposals would be “first on the agenda” in the coming SDS National Council meeting that fall.

(It is hard to say whether or not, the LC proposal was adopted by national SDS. In his book Kirkpatrick Sale discusses the major SDS fall National Council gathering held at the University of Colorado at Boulder on 11-13 October 1968. Unfortunately, he only mentions the fact that PL’s proposal for a Student Labor Action Project (SLAP) advanced by Jared Israel was defeated by a two to one vote.)

In preparation for the Boulder meeting, PL put out its October issue of PL’s theoretical journal *Progressive Labor*. It included not just Jeff Gordon’s article but Rick Rhoads’ “Len Marcus – Guru of Non-Struggle,” an attack on the LC that ran some 17 pages. (The article includes an extremely rare photo of LaRouche wearing a long beard and teaching at the Columbia Liberation School with a portrait of V. I. Lenin in the background.)

Throughout the summer of 1968, the Labor Committee and PL carried out rival attempts to organize the New York City Garment Industry. In the September 1968 issue of *Challenge*, PL complained that the LC leaflets and paper (Solidarity) offered a “defeatist” line in sharp contrast to PL’s own summer project known as “the SDS Work-In Committee.”

## **KNOCK KNOCK! IT’S THE MOTHER\*\*\*\*ERS**

For *Progressive Labor* to run a 17 page long major article on “Len Marcus” shows that PL’s leadership was starting to take the Labor Committee seriously. Yet one of the most prophetic incidents for both the LC and PL that took place at the June East Lansing convention didn’t involve the LC at all. Instead it revolved around a clash between PL and Ben Morea’s Up Against the Wall Mother\*\*\*\*er Lower East Side SDS chapter.

From Jeff Gordon's article: "Another proposal for structural change was presented by the 'Up Against the Wall, Mother\*\*\*\*er' (UAW/MF) chapter of SDS. This group of anarchist-hippies from New York's Lower East Side played a disruptive role throughout the convention, with the support and encouragement of many members of the National Office/New Working Class (NO/NWC) caucus. They have been using these same tactics at regional meetings for the past half year. They interrupted debate and shouted down any speaker with whom they disagreed, particularly when the speaker was a member of PLP. Their behavior at the Convention disrupted constructive political debate, intimidated people new to SDS, and gave the meeting at times the aura of a fascist gathering.

"At one point their actions, led by UAW/MF leader Ben Morea almost resulted in a full-scale brawl. They persisted in trying to shout down a speech by John Levin of PLP . . . But that wasn't enough for the UAW/MF group. They shouted that they wanted guns and violent revolution now. Their actions and words were classic form for provocateurs. They backed down in this instance after a show of physical determination by those who wanted John to speak.

"Their proposal for restructuring the organization betrayed their desire to base SDS more and more on hippy dropouts and less and less on students who have a campus base. UAW/MF holds, similar to many 'new working class' advocates, that the revolutionary demand to workers and students is 'quit.' Their proposal, called 'The Destruction of SDS,' was rejected by a wide margin."

UAW/MF was also active during the Columbia Strike. They also helped shape the LC's views that the New Left had the potential to deteriorate into a kind of deranged band of leftwing fascists, a rather interesting fact given the future disastrous history of the Labor Committee itself.

In his 1974 "*Conceptual History of the Labor Committees*," LaRouche writes about UAW/MF this way: "The Ford Foundation conduited money through numerous counter-insurgency formations which it set up throughout the country. The local franchise for the Lower East Side was held by the 'East Side Service Organization' (ESSO), a scummy proto-fascist gang which masqueraded as the ultra-anarchist SDS faction 'Up Against the Wall Mother\*\*\*\*ers.' Members of Rudd's group were trained in karate and got other backup through ESSO. Tom Newman, the nephew of Herbert Marcuse, was the agent on the scene, administered ESSO, and dispersed funds through an unlimited checking account."

Was any of this true?

### **FUNNY MONEY? OR DID FORD REALLY HAVE A BETTER IDEA?**

UAW/MF first surfaced at a regional SDS conference held at NYU on 10-11 February 1968. On Sunday 11 February, you could – among other choices – either join a UAW/MF demonstration at the offices of the underground paper *RAT* at 201 East 4th

Street by Avenue A; attend a session on women's liberation led by – among others – Bernadine Dohrn; or join in a discussion of the SDS Transit Project chaired by Leif Johnson and Steve Komm.

As for UAW/MF, it was the creature of Ben Morea, a charismatic New York City artist. A former petty criminal and heroin addict, after getting out of jail and kicking his habit, Morea in the early 1960's discovered the Lower East Side avant-garde anarchist culture of Julian Beck and Judith Malina's Living Theater. They, in turn, introduced Morea to long-time anarchist Murry Bookchin. Morea next became involved in a radical art project called *Black Mask*. UAW-MF emerged as a much more street tough group out of the rubble of *Black Mask*. UAW-MF was somewhat similar to Kommune I in West Berlin with the huge difference being that UAW-MF actively shunned publicity unlike their media-friendly East Village copycat, the Yippies.

So was the Ford Foundation behind Ben Morea?

First, ESSO (The East Side Service Organization -- sometimes called the East Side Survival Organization) did exist and was located at 341 East 10th St. According to Osha (formerly Tom) Neumann, ESSO was the "business name" established by UAW-MF so the Judson Church could give the group some money to help aid the vast influx of hippies and street people who began to flood into the Village starting in 1967.

Ben Morea also recalled: "We were always trying to connect the hippy part of the Lower East Side community with the street and homeless part. . . . We set up a store front to give homeless people as well as ourselves a place to hang out. We had free clothes, doctors and lawyers on retainers, a mimeograph, information for people who wanted to dodge the draft and get fake ID, information on crash pads, etc. It was a general help center. We did free food a couple of nights a week, but also held free food events in a hall or a church on the others where we would feed up to 300-400 people. We got some papers from a church [Judson Memorial] saying we were a non-profit and that allowed us to get day old or incorrectly marked stuff from the produce markets and food outlets for free. Some people worked, others made donations and the same papers helped us to hustle up grants from liberal churches to rent places, etc."

Abbie Hoffman biographer Marty Jeter also states that ESSO received funds from "a New York City poverty agency" although he fails to supply any more details. As for Hoffman, he became the figurehead chairman of ESSO's Board of Directors which apparently was incorporated to legally receive outside funds. There was no hard and fast dividing line between Hoffman's Yippies and UAW/MF given the ESSO overlap. It may well be true that members of UAW/MF did receive funds indirectly from New York City.

On 11 October 1968 – in the wake of the disastrous Democratic Convention in Chicago – the *New York Times* reported on a NY City Council investigation of fraud in the Human Resources Administration (HRA) that administered some \$1.5 billion dollars in anti-poverty funds. And as fate would have it, ESSO "chairman" Abbie Hoffman pops up

in the ensuing controversy.

Two New York City Councilmen – Queens Republican Joseph Modugno and Bronx Democrat Bertram Gelfand -- charged that HRA money “was used to transport youth demonstrators to the Democratic National Convention in Chicago in August,” charges that the head of the HRA, Mitchell Ginsberg, deemed “utterly false.” The charges, however, were reportedly based on a recent series of investigations into the Neighborhood Youth Corps, which led to seven Human Services employees being charged with the embezzlement of some \$1.5 million dollars over some 14 months.

Councilman Gelfand, a former Bronx Assistant District Attorney, said that anti-poverty funds were even used to send protestors to Chicago. The key funding conduit, Gelfand charged, came out of a \$30,000 appropriation by the Mayor’s Urban Task Force – headed by Barry Gotterher, an assistant to Mayor Lindsay – to the city’s Youth Service Agency for the establishment of the Free Store on 14 Cooper Square. The Free Store first opened on 15 June 1968 and was used as “a gathering place for hippies and Yippies who are members of the Youth International Party.”

Another *New York Times* article – this one on 9 November 1968 –carried an interview with Herbert Moore, the director of the Youth Services Agency, who ran the Free Store with what he said was some \$40,000 in city money. Moore told the paper that “the store staff had consisted of one other Youth Service Agency member in addition to himself and eight hippies recruited from the neighborhood. In addition about 20 Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees were used during the summer and the store channeled 20 to 25 other corps youths to churches and non-profit organizations . . . The operation’s best-known aide was Abbie Hoffman . . . . A Human Resources Administration spokesman said Mr. Hoffman worked 17 days between July 15 and September 20 as a consultant who provided ‘insights’ at \$40 a day.” It seems quite possible, then, that – intentionally or not -- via ESSO the UAW-MF may have gotten some city funds as the Lindsay government tried to deal with the flood of hippies pouring into the Village in the mid-1960s.

As for the UAW/MF, one of their leaders, Tom Neumann, later fondly recalled: “By the beginning of 1968, we had become a formidable presence on the Lower East Side. We ran free stores and crash pads. We organized community feasts in the courtyard of St. Marks Church. We propagandized against the merchandizing of hip culture and shook down the psychedelic stores for contributions to our cause. We scammed and shoplifted. Communists took jobs at factories, to be close to ‘the people.’ Mother\*\*\*\*ers hung out on the streets to be close to our people, the ‘freaks’ as we fondly called them. Communists went to work. We did as little work as possible.”

## **RAT**

As the deadline for the Chicago Democratic Convention approached, rumors circulated that the protestors were planning acts of violence as well as dropping LSD into the city’s water supply. Whatever the combination of rumor, deliberate fabrication, and media

exaggeration – no doubt in part inflamed by the government – the UAW/MF openly embraced violent revolution and terrorism. Assuming that BOSSI (the New York Police's Bureau of Special Services and Investigations – the counter-intelligence department of the police) was wiretapping and infiltrating the Lower East Side radical scene, they would have heard the same kind of talk constantly from the Mother\*\*\*\*ers.

Although Ben Morea avoided Chicago, Tom Neumann shared the stage at Grant Park with Tom Hayden and other radical speakers. In his memoirs, Neumann recalls: "Perhaps because of my speeches, and perhaps because I was the most visible Mother\*\*\*\*er in Chicago, I was named as an unindicted co-conspirator in the indictment that launched the Chicago Conspiracy Trial." Neumann's also recalled: "We asked ourselves who would be willing to take up the gun if, as was inevitable, legitimate political processes failed. The Mother\*\*\*\*ers bought shotguns and pistols, cut the shotguns down, and stashed them beneath the floorboards of our apartments. We were preparing for the coming flood of violence and counter-violence."

Yet you didn't have to be a BOSSI spy to know that factions inside SDS were embracing violence. All you had to do was read the pages of *RAT*, the underground newspaper created by Jeff Shero in New York City in March 1968. A radical leader at the University of Texas at Austin, in 1965 Shero was elected SDS vice-president while Carl Oglesby was chosen president.

Shero's *RAT (RAT Subterranean News)* soon became intimately involved in the Columbia strike. Documents showing Columbia's ties to the CIA and the military-industrial complex that were stolen during the uprising were first published in the pages of *RAT*. *RAT* also regularly opened its pages to members of the UAW-MF so they could publish their rants even as *RAT* started publishing diagrams illustrating how to make simple explosives. In 1969, *RAT* staffer and Swarthmore College grad Jane Alpert took part in a series of bombings in New York before being arrested while planting dynamite on National Guard trucks. Needless to say, the increasing calls to violence by bitterly anti-PL sects like UAW-MF only further fueled PL's sense that it too smelled a rat, namely a major police provocation operation meant to discredit the left.

### **"THE PORT AUTHORITY STATEMENT" AND THE "NEW WORKING CLASS"**

When UAW-MF first appeared on the scene shortly before the February 1968 meeting at NYU, the SDS local paper, *Firebomb*, stated: "A new radical group on the Lower East Side, called Up Against the Wall Mother\*\*\*\*er has just been formed. . . . If people are interested in the group itself, they should contact Tom Neumann or Bob Gottlieb at the SDS regional office."

Tom Neumann [not "Newman"] a/k/a "Tom Mother\*\*\*\*er" really was the stepson [not the nephew] of famed philosopher Herbert Marcuse. Neumann's biological father was Franz Neumann, the author of the classic book *Behemoth*. He was yet a Jewish Frankfurt School exile who worked with his good friend Marcuse in the OSS during World War II. Franz's wife Inge (Tom's biological mother) remarried Marcuse shortly after Franz

Neumann died in a car crash in Switzerland some years after the war.

Bob Gottlieb, a graduate student in sociology at the New School for Social Research, helped coordinate the local SDS office. Gottlieb, however, was best known for being one of three New School grad student co-authors of the “the Port Authority Statement.” This playfully-named but densely written text tried to introduce SDS to ideas then most closely associated with Andre Gorz (author of *Strategy for Labor in the Age of Neo-capitalism*), Serge Mallet, and Herbert Marcuse. Through “The Port Authority Statement,” SDS was now introduced to what would be dubbed the “new working class” (NWC) theory.

NWC theory reinforced already-existing arguments inside SDS that students should focus most on student issues. Such views were most associated with SDS leader Carl Davidson. In August 1966 Davidson submitted a proposal to SDS entitled “Towards a Student Syndicalist Movement, or University Reform Revisited.” He later contributed ideas to New Left Notes under a headline entitled “Praxis” (On the importance of Davidson’s paper, see Kirkpatrick Sale, *SDS*.)

At Columbia, this student syndicalist tendency led by Ted Gold with off-campus theoretical support from Dave Gilbert became known as the “Praxis axis” in opposition to Mark Rudd’s “action faction.” (Gold and Gilbert would side with RYM I during the 1969 debacle in Chicago. Gold would later be killed building a bomb in 1970. Gilbert is currently serving a lifetime jail sentence for his involvement in the 20 October 1981 disastrous botched robbery of a Brinks truck in Nyack, New York.)

Bob Gottlieb, Gerry Tenny and Dave Gilbert publicly presented their arguments on 17 February 1967 at a Radical Education Project (REP) conference held in Princeton University’s McCosh Hall. Kirkpatrick Sale summarizes “the Port Authority Statement” this way: “The new working class, unlike the traditional working class, is made up of people with ‘technical, clerical, and professional jobs that require educational backgrounds,’ and of those in the schools and universities who provide them with those backgrounds. The new class ‘lies at the very hub of production’ and is crucial for the operation of a highly industrialized, technocratic, computerized, and sophisticated society.” Inside SDS, the “new working class” line would be embraced by Greg Calvert, an SDS National Secretary who spoke to the Princeton REP gathering that Sunday. Calvert and Carol Neiman aggressively promoted the “new working class” theory first in the pages of journals like the *Guardian*.

## **FROM “THE TRIPLE REVOLUTION” TO “UNDERCONSUMPTIONISM”**

The “new working class” idea, however, arguably had even deeper roots. In the early 1960s, C. Wright Mills had famously called for “overcoming” the Old Left’s “labor metaphysic.”

The early 1960s also saw the brief flourishing of the left-liberal Ad Hoc Committee on the Triple Revolution. Tremendously influenced by the rise of automation and

cybernetics, the Committee on the Triple Revolution in late March 1964 issued its own manifesto on the future. It outlined what they saw as vast structural changes in the future American economy that would be rooted in a radically changing composition of the American labor force. The document predicted a brewing major social crisis in America as technological modernization in particular fueled deep structural unemployment.

*The Triple Revolution* – which was clearly meant to influence the Kennedy Administration along the lines of Michael Harrington’s famous book *The Other America* but only came out shortly after JFK’s assassination. It was signed not just by leading liberals like Gunnar Myrdal, W. H. (Ping) Ferry, Linus Pauling, and H. Stuart Hughes but also more overtly leftist thinkers that included the Socialist Party’s Michael Harrington as well as two top SDS leaders, Tom Hayden and Todd Gitlin.

With their “new working class” theory, Gottlieb, Terry and Gilbert were in a way making a virtue out of the crisis predicted by “The Triple Revolution” by elevating students and the skilled technical intelligentsia over traditional blue collar workers.

Dave Gilbert would soon go one step further. On the heels of the Columbia strike and the utopian impulses it helped unleash, Dave Gilbert published a pamphlet somewhat grandly entitled *Consumption: Domestic Imperialism, A New Left Introduction to the Political Economy of American Capitalism*. Gilbert argued that “we have already begun to develop alternatives to the existing system. In the liberated buildings of Columbia, in the dropout communities of New York, San Francisco, and dozens of other cities, we are beginning to build our own commonwealth, our own culture.” Gilbert would soon wind up fiercely promoting the RYM I idea that the “white working class” has been hopelessly “bought off” by the cornucopia of goods produced in the “advanced capitalist sector” that also made them completely unwilling to reject their “white skin privilege” and join the revolutionary struggle.

In September 1968 issue of the *Campaigner* the Labor Committee responded to Gilbert’s pamphlet in an Ed Spannaus and Leif Johnson essay entitled “Underconsumption: False Currency.” Here they attacked Gilbert’s “vision of fully cybernated communism.” Communism could only be a vision for Gilbert since he could only imagine the youth culture and oppressed inner city blacks as the two revolutionary vanguards in America who totally rejected the entire system. But “no social revolution can proceed on such anti-social desires. And as the dropouts are not the social base of revolution, Gilbert’s work is not the intellectual base.”

### **“LEN MARCUS” – THE NEW LENIN! -- NOT**

Not surprisingly, PL bitterly attacked the “new working class” theory. In his October 1968 article “SDS: An Analysis,” PL’s Jeff Gordon critiqued different variations of the “new working class” line that included 1) the Bell-Dohrn-Halliwell proposal for SDS (named after its authors, Tom Bell, Bernadine Dohrn and Steve Halliwell); 2) the “Calvert-Neiman” line; and 3) Dave Gilbert’s *Consumption* pamphlet.

Against the “new working class” paradigm, Gordon argued: “Automation and cybernation lead to intensification of the class struggle, not its lessening. The working class knows these developments are costing them jobs.” As for the Marcuse argument about post-scarcity society, the ruling elite always is out to persuade the masses “that they never had it so good.” The truth is that “things are getting poorer, smaller, and worse for the working class.”

Progressive Labor would also attack the Labor Committee for sharing the very “new working class” ideas it otherwise attacked. First it should be kept in mind that in late May 1968, Fraser and Papert presented their final critique of PL in a paper entitled “*Economism or Socialism?*”

Here Fraser and Papert argued that PL’s emphasis on “point of production” organizing showed it was just another tired “Fosterist” organization. The reference was to CPUSA leader William Z. Foster, who before joining the CP had played a highly prominent role as a leading “anarcho-syndicalist” labor organizer. After Earl Browder’s fall from power with the end of the “Popular Front” line in the late 1940s, Foster regained new prominence inside the CP. Given that PLP’s founders came out of Foster-encouraged “factory colonization” work, Fraser and Papert claimed that they were still trapped in Foster’s old way of thinking. But what was Foster’s approach but a version of the “labor syndicalist” outlook that he had held for decades in different guises?

PL counterattacked by claiming that the LC’s shift away from supporting working class struggle “at the point of production” to a “class-for-itself” concept was itself in practice more “new working class” rope a dope. In his classes at both FUNY and the Columbia Liberation School, LaRouche made little secret of the need for a Leninist revolutionary cadre organization composed of the most advanced intellectuals who had freed themselves from their own formerly parochial identity. This vanguard grouping would provide the intellectual general staff during a “mass strike” period. It would develop the critical programmatic demands that would insure the political struggles remained on revolutionary course and not stumble back into “Menshevik” like “economism.”

Yet, the Labor Committee’s – PL argued -- never focused on the direct seizure of power. Instead, it thrived on various Popular-Front “social democratic” and reformist schemes to tax the rich and redistribute income. For all of LaRouche’s Leninist huff and puff, it was the Labor Committee that remained hopelessly “reformist.”

The Labor Committee’s intellectual arrogance also hinged on its adherence to a version of the “new working class” line even as the LC attacked Praxis theorists at Columbia. In short, while the “new working class” line proclaimed students as the new vanguard, the LC took this delusion one step further and made the “revolutionary intelligentsia” – Lyndon’s whiz-kids – the technocratic arbiters of the post-capitalist order just on the horizon as soon as capitalism did the only decent thing it could do and collapse.

In his October 1968 essay on the Labor Committee (“Len Marcus: Guru of Non-



Struggle”), Rick Rhoads set the tone for PL’s attack when he wrote that the Labor Committee “claims that technical expertise in production on the part of students and intellectuals is the key to developing the revolutionary movement.” Rhoads goes on to quote from the LaRouche/Papert text, “The Mass Strike,” that was written in mid-May 1968 and first circulated in mimeographed form at the East Lansing SDS conference:

“Students . . . represent that layer uniquely attuned to putting bourgeois management technology [recall that LaRouche made his living – or pretended to – as an “efficiency expert” – HH] at the disposal of the working class and its allies. . . Students potentially embody the means by which working people can create their own complete alternative to the economic institutions of the ruling class. . . Students can arm the potentially revolutionary layers with a program, a decisive prerequisite for an effective mass-revolutionary struggle.”

Rhoads comments that such a “miraculous line” promoted by “Marcusism” probably will amount to nothing but it is worth examining as it “combines the attraction of a non-struggle, get-there-quick outlook with the superficial advocacy of the worker-student alliance.”

For PL then, the Labor Committee recycled “new working class” delusions in a working mans’ lunch pail. For PL to be denounced as “Fosterist” by Lyndon’s whiz kids was actually a compliment and not an insult. Unlike the Labor Committee, PL saw itself at its core as a 100% genuine working class party even though in reality it too was an almost entirely student-driven organization with very few “real workers” on board.

### **BAD MARX: PL GRADES HERBERT MARCUSE**

Yet if the real crime of the Labor Committee was to superficially advocate a worker-student alliance, at least it still advocated one. For PL, the big guns had to be turned on other factions inside SDS infatuated with people like Herbert Marcuse.

In the same issue attacking the Labor Committee, PL refuted Marcuse in a long essay by Jared Israel and William Russel entitled “Herbert Marcuse and his Philosophy of Copout.” It also tried to expose Marcuse’s attempts to prove “that workers love the system.” Quoting Marcuse’s claim in *One Dimensional Man* that “the worker and his boss enjoy the same television program and visit the same resort places . . . the typist is as attractively made up as the daughter of her employer . . . the Negro owns a Cadillac . . .” Israel and Russel remark: “Here, in one sentence, he [Marcuse] manages to refute Marxism, absolve the bosses, sneer at the workers, toss a crumb to male chauvinism, and accept a racist jibe as fact.”

PL would return to Marcuse in the February 1969 issue of *Progressive Labor* with a fascinating expose entitled “Marcuse: Cop-Out or Cop?” It documented not only Marcuse’s work for the OSS during World War II but his ties to the State Department’s Central European Branch that worked under Frank Wisner and Marcuse’s later sojourns both at the U.S. intelligence-associated Russian Institute at Columbia and the Russian

Research Center at Harvard where Marcuse's "Project on the Soviet Social System" was directly funded by a grant from the U.S. Air Force. (Although I can't prove it, I suspect this article also influenced the Labor Committee's already highly suspicious view of much of the New Left.)

### **"WE'RE THE INDIANS!": MARK RUDD MEETS THE MOTHER\*\*\*\*ERS**

If the SDS advocates of the "new working class" line hoped to use UAW-MF as a club against PL, they would ultimately be badly disappointed. Instead of building up SDS, UAW-MF wanted to destroy it completely by breaking down the entire organization into anarchist collectives pursuing an anti-technological and primitivist-communal agenda.

Like the Cleaver faction of the BPP, UAW-MF identified most with street people and other "lumpen" elements; not affluent white college boys looking to get high and get laid on St. Marks Place while making sure they didn't wind up carrying a gun in Vietnam.

One famous incident from the time highlights the UAW-MF's view of SDS. At the SDS regional gathering held at the University of Kentucky on the last weekend of March 1968, former SDS president Carl Oglesby – fresh from his discussions with members of Business International – came down from the mountaintop to explain to his listeners that the U.S. ruling class had split between pro-RFK liberal "Yankee" internationals and their Southeast-based "Cowboy" opponents. The good news was that since the Yankee internationalists had now completely soured on Vietnam, after they won the 1968 election, they would rapidly end the war. This in turn meant that SDS should get ahead of the curve by scaling back on anti-war organizing and instead return to its mission of radicalizing the cities. Above all else, SDS needed to focus on aiding inner city rebellion and begin supplying blacks with guns.

Hearing Oglesby's arguments, Ben Morea flipped out. Approaching Oglesby in a menacing way, he yelled: "Donate arms! And let Black people do all the fighting and bleeding while SDS sits securely in the classrooms! White radicals have to fight too, you honky! They may be either Yankees or Cowboys, but we're the Indians!"

Morea's outburst and confrontational style entranced at least one member of SDS present at the meeting: Mark Rudd. Back in New York, Rudd – a white Jewish suburban boy from New Jersey -- began hanging out with the Mother\*\*\*\*ers and copying both their rhetoric and swagger.

From Osha (Tom) Neumann's memoirs: "That Mark [Rudd] picked up on the rhetoric of the Mother\*\*\*\*ers [during the Columbia Strike] was not fortuitous. Mark had seen Ben and a cohort of Mother\*\*\*\*ers disrupt an SDS convention by shouting at speakers with whom we disagreed, 'That's bull\*\*\*\* and you know it.' He liked the phrase. After the convention he had hung out with us a bit on the Lower East Side. He was impressed by our impatience with theory and influenced by our reliance on the vivifying effect of action in the streets to draw converts to our cause.

In Columbia SDS he [Rudd] formed an ‘action faction,’ in opposition to the ‘praxis axis,’ whose members talked Marxist theory and believed in the need to educate people before they could act. Mark had gone to Cuba, and willingly admitted to being an adherent of the cult of Che. He read Regis Debray’s *Revolution in the Revolution*, which argued that the revolution begins with armed struggle of small bands of guerrillas. In Mark’s head, Che, Debray, and the Mother\*\*\*\*ers were all singing the same song: Action is educational!”

When Columbia happened, Ben Morea and his merry band of Mother\*\*\*\*ers helped hold the Mathematics Building which, as Neumann later recalled, “was quickly transformed into a reasonable facsimile of a Lower East Side crash pad” as the Mother\*\*\*\*ers became – at least in their own minds – “the vanguard of the new order, vandals of liberation, sworn enemies of all hierarchical institution. . . . SDS organizers made pilgrimages to our crash pads. Some of them later joined the Weathermen, which went through its own distinctly Mother\*\*\*\*eresque stage before it disappeared underground.”

For the proto-Weatherman SDS “action faction,” the UAW-MF became a kind of “Electric Acid Kool Aid Test” for being a true revolutionary. For their part, UAW-Mf taunted SDS with a poem labeled “Chapter Report on the SDS Regional Council of March 10”:

*A Molotov Cocktail/is a bottle filled with/three parts kerosene/and one part motor oil/it is capped/and wrapped/with cotton/soaked with gasoline.  
To use --- light cotton/throw bottle  
Fire and explosion occur/on impact with target.  
A “white radical”/is three parts bull\*\*\*\*/and one part hesitation/  
It is not revolutionary/and should not be/stockpiled/at this time.  
Respectfully submitted,  
Up Against the Wall Mother\*\*\*\*er.*

### **“THE NEW LEFT, LOCAL CONTROL AND FASCISM”**

The rise of the Rudd’s “action faction” led to a series of increasingly physical confrontations with PL, the anti-counter-culture, anti-drug, anti-fun “short hair” Stalin groupies who to their opponents must have seemed something like the Borg. PL cadre, meanwhile, reportedly physically evicted a UAW-MF allied group from their Morningside Heights apartment. To PL if groups like UAW-MF weren’t deliberate police provocations they were doing a very good imitation of just that.

The collapse of SDS following the disastrous National Conference in Chicago in June 1969 was also documented in an article entitled “SDS: Beyond the Grave” published in the September-October 1969 issue of the *Campaigner*. The article included a description of a Rudd-called SDS meeting in the second week of July shortly after the split which captured just how much things had deteriorated in the “beloved community” that now seemed more and more to resemble two feuding factions of Japan’s

Zengakuren: “Mark Rudd and his local followers convened a rump SDS regional gathering at New York University’s Loeb Student Center. Rudd’s elaborate internal security checks, loyalty oaths, passwords, and so forth set the tone for what was immediately to follow there. . . . Admission to the meeting was limited to a single-wing of a double-door of the auditorium, behind which a gaggle of musclemen and fingermen singled out unwanted applicants for admission, and otherwise occupied themselves in conducting political interrogations, administering oaths, and celebrating other rites of political democracy.

“At first push by a RYM muscleman, PL took the anarchists’ bait and mobilized to surge en masse against the barred doorway.

“While PL expressed the conviction that ‘it is better to give than receive,’ Rudd’s goon squad barely managed to hold the doorway. Behind the front line of Ruddite plug-uglies, another RYM theoretician, wielding a long, metal-tipped pole, attempted to puncture PL skulls for a discreet distance. A flying potted palm, flanked by accompanying chairs and bric-a-brac, added counterpoint to the main theme of pounding fists. Later, as RYM brought a fire-hose into play, toe-to-toe slugging was superseded by successive rushes. Just as PL marshaled its forces for a final rush (which would have certainly carried), three New York City policemen rushed forward, pistols drawn, to rescue the beleaguered Rudd forces.

“At this juncture, PL student ‘floor leader’ Jeff Gordon seemed undecided whether to be more enraged at the drawn guns of the police or more gratified to discover Rudd and the police on the same side of the barricades. After delivering himself of several sentences using the word ‘pig,’ Gordon led the groups outside to a brief rally in an adjacent park. Meanwhile under continued police protection, the assembled anarchists listened to Rudd promising reenactments of the preceding affray on many campuses.”

In September 1968, the LC responded to the rise of Rudd’s “action faction” with Larouche and Carol’s *Campaigner* essay, “The New Left, Local Control, and Fascism.” In their introduction to the issue (“The Politics of Crisis”), the journal’s editors remark that the article looks at “a layer of Sorelian-type anarchists, partly recruited from nominal anarchist groupings (such as Black Mask and the ‘Situationist International’) and past members of PLP’s old May 2nd Movement.”

LaRouche’s article opens: “It is an irony of history that certain New Lefters today would be quite at home with Mussolini’s radical polemics. This is not to suggest that these New Lefters are fascists, but to emphasize that fascism at its inception always appears as a movement which poses a revolutionary challenge to capitalism. Only in this way can it win popular support.” In its concluding section, the article states that the “alliance of Praxisites and street-syndicalists which has directed and weakened the Columbia strike organization this summer defends its actions with phrases which might almost be a plagiarism from Mussolini’s left anti-Marxist demagoguery and recall those of the red-hunt [against PL – HH] at the East Lansing SDS convention. It is necessary to expose both these syndicalist ideas and the influence of the counter-revolutionary practices for

which they stand.”

Yet just as the September issue of the *Campaigner* was rolling off the presses, a crisis that had been brewing inside New York City for some time between the teachers union and black community control advocates was on the brink of explosion. With the famous New York City teachers strike that early autumn, the relatively tiny Labor Committee would find itself under fierce attack not just by the “Praxis axis,” and the “action faction” but by PL as well.

If the encounter with UAW-MF proved to be Mark Rudd’s personal Electric Acid Kool Aid Test, the teachers strike and the crisis it provoked inside the Left would prove the same for the Labor Committee.

### THREE RESEARCH NOTES

**NOTE ONE SOURCES:** An article by Samuel P. Hays entitled “Right Face, Left Face: The Columbia Strike” first published in *Political Science Quarterly*, 84/2 (Lune 1969) has some interesting references to the early Labor Committee. Hays reports that the first issue of *The Campaigner* appeared in February 1968.

Hays also provide cites for other sources that I have not examined. They are an article in the 31 October 1968 *Columbia Spectator* by Louis Dolinar entitled “Labor Committee Disbanded by SDS General Assembly” as well as an article by Tony Papert in the same paper entitled “Community Control, a Better Idea” on 7 November 1968, Hays also mentions an article by Larry Poleshuck in the December 1968 issue of PL’s *Challenge* entitled “Phony ‘Labor Committee’ Loses SDS Name.”

On UAW-MF, see Osha [formerly Tom] Neumann, *Up Against the Wall Motherf\*\*ker* (2008); and *Black Mask & Up Against the Wall Mother\*\*\*\*er: the Incomplete Works of Ron Hahne, Ben Morea and the Black Mask Group* (1993).

For detailed descriptions of the REP Princeton meeting, the February 1968 New York SDS meeting at NYU and even a detailed look at the founding of the national Committees for Independent Political Action (CIPA), see Alice Widener’s work *Student Subversion* now available for download on the web.

An invaluable reconstruction of the events at Columbia from a very non-Labor Committee point of view can be found at Bob Feldman’s invaluable memoir at [http://bfeldman68.blogspot.com/search...0Memories%20\(3\).](http://bfeldman68.blogspot.com/search...0Memories%20(3).))

For an interesting look at the way the “Triple Revolution” thesis even affected the Socialist Workers Party, see James Cannon’s lecture on the subject that can be listened to on You Tube at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rYWJZWXOyUY>. In 1971, Random House published Calvert and Neiman’s *A Disrupted History: The New Left and the New Capitalism* that more deeply explored NWC theory.

Finally, for a look at the very early Labor Committee analysis of the East Lansing SDS conference that is critical of the way PL was treated at the meeting, see Paul Milkman's letter to the *Guardian* written on 23 June 1968 and reprinted in the September 1968 issue of the *Campaigner*.

## **NOTE TWO: ORIGINS OF THE CAMPAIGNER**

The earliest issue of the *Campaigner* that I have seen is Vol. 1, No. 3 from June 1968. [NOTE: In a later NMF an even earlier issue will be described – HH] It includes LaRouche's article "The Mass Strike," written on 19 May 1968. It also advertises (for 10 cents each!) these pamphlets: 1) Sharing the Poverty by Paul Gallagher and Ed Spannaus; 2) Bringing It All Back Home by Robert Dillon; 3) The Mass Strike by LaRouche; 4) The Knowledge Industry: Bureaucratic Capitalism's University System by Leif Johnson; and 5) An Analysis of the Columbia Strike by Steve Komm. "All were published by the New York SDS Labor Committee for the SDS National Convention."

The *Campaigner* Editorial Board include among the regulars, Georgina Bradeen (presumably related to Nancy Bradeen Spannaus), Virginia Combathrekis, and Harlem Fightback's Jim Houghton. The issue also carries an introductory "New Campaigner Policy Statement" stating that thanks to the transit strike work and the Columbia Strike, "the majority of the regional SDS 'Labor Committee' discovered its commonality of political method and perspectives." The issue also republishes a talk Leif Johnson gave on the WBAI radio station.

The editorial introduction to the June 1968 *Campaigner* also provides some useful background history. It states that "within a month," the new grouping has "created over a hundred committed cadre" where there were before only two dozen such radicals. It was then decided that "our editorial board should be broadened to reflect" the larger movement "and to make the Campaigner an urgently needed vehicle for reporting the key political lessons of the Columbia Strike."

Since the two earlier issues of the *Campaigner* were published presumably before Columbia, they almost certainly were issued by the Regional SDS Labor Committee and centered on the transit issue. As we have seen, the Regional SDS Labor Committee really was an SDS grouping and had emerged in late 1967 following its establishment at the Princeton SDS regional gathering. Since the National Caucus of SDS Labor Committees only itself was created in May 1968, it seems reasonable to suggest that the June 1968 *Campaigner* was the first issue aligned directly with the new National Caucus of SDS Labor Committees. [NOTE: In fact the Campaigner would prove to be a creation of LaRouche and his supporters from the very first issue. – HH]

## **NOTE THREE: ONE, TWO, THREE, MANY MARCUSES!**

Tom Neumann— who change his first name to Osha in the early 1970s – makes it vividly clear in his memoirs that he deeply loathed his stepfather unlike Abbie Hoffman who had studied under Marcuse at Brandeis and greatly admired the philosopher.

Tom Neumann's younger biological brother, Michael, also happened to be a student at Columbia. A founding member of Columbia SDS, he actually was the roommate of Mark Rudd. But Michael Neumann more or less opposed the Columbia Strike. According to Osha Neumann's book, *Up against the Wall Motherf\*\*ker*, his brother Michael "agreed with Herbert [Marcuse] that universities, whatever their shortcomings, were realms of comparative freedom, and therefore disrupting them was counter-productive."

Besides Herbert Marcuse's stepsons, Tom and Michael, there is yet another Marcuse who should be mentioned – Herbert's biological son Peter Marcuse. Peter Marcuse was 40 years old in 1968. Born in Berlin in 1928, his mother was Sophie Marcuse, whom Herbert divorced shortly before marrying Inge Neumann. After getting a BA at Harvard in 1948 and a JD at Yale Law School in 1953, Peter Marcuse received an MA at Columbia in 1963. In 1968, he was at Yale getting a Master's Degree in Urban Studies and by 1972 he had earned a PhD in Urban Planning at Berkeley. After teaching Urban Planning at UCLA from 1972 to 1975, he came to Columbia to teach Urban Planning. He seems to have played absolutely no role at Columbia during the 1968 Strike.

**STYLE COMMENT:** The ridiculous stars (\*\*\*) when it comes to the word Mother\*\*\*\*er were put in by some kind of automatic program that converts the letters in the word "Mother\*\*\*\*er" into stars each time I save this document when editing. I have nothing to do with this. -- HH

---

*Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 07-06-2009 at 07:53 AM.*

## **FROM LAROU CJHETRUTH**

### **A few tidbit clarifications**

HH, thanks so much for providing such a wonderfully rich picture of the details of the political scene of the late '60s in which "the org" was hatched, kind of the primordial soup from which "life," aka the National Caucus of Labor Committees, emerged (using the word "life" guardedly, to be sure). Nothing here that was utterly startling, pretty much stayed within the lines of what I thought I knew, only in much more general terms than the great detail you have provided. I did not know the context of the NYC Left in which the FUNY emerged, which was HLH's launching pad to attract his first recruits other than Carol. And the way this intersected the impending crackup of SDS, which involved at least 4 competing tendencies.

Just a couple of secondary or tertiary observations. First of all, at one point you asserted (or the NMF did) that by April or May of 1968, the "National Caucus of Labor Committees" was created, consisting of the New York and Philly SDS Labor Committees. But in another location, you referred to a June publication, perhaps an early *Campaigner* that referred simply to the two committees. My memory strongly tells me that the NCLC was not created until some time in 1969, quite possibly not until after the crackup of SDS in June of that year.

And referring to the long post you wrote just prior to this final installment of the NMFs, you were talking about the origins of the Fraser faction fight, acknowledging that its cause was still murky. In that location, you omitted any mention of the bomb plot trial, which I believe played a strong, possibly a decisive, role in that fight. Remember that Fraser (and Borgmann) were on trial in context where they didn't know but what they might be about to go to jail for many years, falsely convicted in a blatant frame-up. One of the major issues between them, and Lyn, was over what kind of defense to mount in their behalf. I believe (if any others remember it differently, please chime in) that Fraser wanted as broad a coalition, reaching out to the broadest possible parts of the Left, as possible, for obvious reasons. I believe that Lyn attacked that as "Pop Front" and wanted, well, we know Lyn, God knows what, some sort of much more "political", i.e. narrow, Lyn-centered defense that would have probably ensured their incarceration. This would dovetail with the incipient Fraser faction's articles on Walther Reuther and the Pop Front (looking toward that layer, of labor, "from above," rather than "from below"). I have no specific recollection to this effect, but it wouldn't surprise me, if Lyn even at that early moment was looking forward to testifying "on their behalf," seeing the trial as a major public forum to push himself, with little or no concern for what impact it would actually have on winning the trial. Shades of 1988 and the Alexandria and New York trials, perhaps?

I clearly recall the existence of, but hardly at all recall the content of, the key article in Campaigner by Fraser et al, on this subject of the pop front, Reuther, etc., which article was highly contentious at the time. I believe this article would be a key piece of evidence to flesh out the real meaning of the faction fight, if overlaid on the defense committee battle. Which battle, by the way, came to a head at one point in a very heated meeting at John Covici's house in Philadelphia where the differences were very heatedly aired, and where factional lines perhaps began to be drawn in ways that would congeal into the actual factions.

All of that said, I also believe that precisely as Fraser held out for his own independent position against Lyn, that Lyn began to react as one would expect him to, to not tolerate anyone putting himself on the same pedestal as Lyn. Therefore, I'm sure a key ingredient in the mix was Lyn's moving to sharpen any differences he saw between him and Fraser, rather than seek to find common ground and heal the split. He treated Fraser the way Roosevelt treated Hitler, demanding unconditional surrender, rather than trying to find a way for Fraser to at least save face.

It's also interesting how the bomb plot case was dropped as soon as the faction fight became official--hmm. That is, just when the ability to fight it was greatly weakened, the authorities dropped it, almost as if they regarded the split as just what they wanted to happen.

One final point, in reference to the discussion in the NMFs about the argument between the Action Faction, the Praxis Axis, the PL labor base-builders, and the Marcusite vanguardists, with respect to how the student movement should orient toward labor. I



think that Lyn's position was, at the time, greatly superior to any of the others, and recognized the sociological limitations of workers as unripe for any kind of radical, much less revolutionary, psychology if limited to "base" level ordinary shop floor-type struggles. The adoption of Luxemburg's mass strike perspective, plausible at the time if the economy really was about to tank, provided a mechanism (in thought) to "get from here to there," to provide a way to envision the possibility of a workers' government ever coming about, which no other theory did. And sociologically, the notion that only if workers were united in a common struggle for a broader than a trade union program, a program that proposed to increase the size of the pie, rather than just claim a larger share of a fixed economic pie, would they ever expand their consciousness, was correct. Lyn's emphasis on program, along with the notion of what he later (or perhaps even then) called "the class for itself", were two central features of what he preached at the time that I, and which I'm certain most other members who joined prior to 1973, found so compelling.

### HYLOZOIC HEDGEHOG REPLY TO LAROCHE TRUTH

Thanks very much for the comments.

I still have a few more NMF posts to wade through and one of the last will return to Philly. I've chosen to skip the entire 1970 debate. However you are right that there was some kind of debate over the defense tactics in Philadelphia. The LaRouche faction does attack Fraser for wanting a pop front of sorts for the defense. But factually, I believe the actual charges were only dropped much later. The government had the problem that they were unwilling to disclose information related to wire-tapping and the informant.

I don't know if you were on FactNet then, but I posted from Lexis a good deal relating to the Fraser trial and the LC attempts to contact the Black Panthers and the Red Squad phone tapping and such. (One way to find it is to click on my name and look at the post headlines for HH and they should pop up.)

It is very important to learn more about the split and I just decided not to deal with 1970 directly because 1) I had no lived experience of it except for seeing Steve talk once after the split for the SLC and 2) the documents produced by both sides through 1970 are vast, hard to find, and quite difficult to follow.

But you are 100% right that there was some real showdown between Fraser and LaRouche. I just don't know enough so I don't want to project LaRouche's later crazy behavior too much back to this period as well without knowing a great deal more. The NMF/OMF lack of in-depth discussion of the Fraser-Borgmann case and later faction-fight is a gaping hole in this look back as I've said more than once before. Just your mention of the meeting at Covici's helps fill in critical gaps. So too earlier did **socialistboomer** who before "pay to play" mentioned that -- I think -- Anita G discovered proof that the Fraser group had organized itself into a separate party organization.

Also, your memory about the name NCLC is correct. But I don't think I said that. I believe I said the name was "National Caucus of SDS Labor Committees" and NOT "National Caucus of Labor Committees." Take a look at the posts. If I didn't say "National Caucus of SDS Labor Committees" I should have.

(As an aside of FDR, I think the idea was a negotiated settlement without Hitler was the one that he rejected or at least that was the critique. The people who wanted a negotiated peace said if you offered a deal for Germany's intact borders but get rid of Hitler, there could be a conditional surrender. The counter-argument was a) the system that produced Hitler would be unchanged and b) arguments on this line would have the impact -- intentional or not -- of driving a wedge between the West and Stalin when the Russians were taking the overwhelming number of casualties. But the advocates of a negotiated peace still wanted Hitler the person out, as far as I know.)

As for the LC position in SDS: My take is that "on paper" -- as you say -- it works. I agree with it today as much as I agreed with it then. Compared to the horror of SDS, it made sense.

But after thinking about it, I think it was a mixed bag although far superior to both the Praxis/Action faction types on the one hand and the PL nuts on the other. But in my view, it only makes sense along the lines of "popular front" organizing the CP did in New York politics in the 30s and 40s and is actually reformist. As I shall show, this is how the other orthodox leftist sects viewed the LC. They saw the LC's program as "social democratic."

The big contradiction in the LC was the idea that the program could lead to revolution as opposed to social reform. And in practice, the "mass strike" at Columbia was in a way too successful in the sense that it made SDS so popular that the new r-r-r-radicals were almost all student syndicalist types who had zero interest spending the summer leafleting garment workers, etc. The "soviet" produced by Columbia marginalized the LC tendency which in a way had more influence when SDS was much smaller and everybody knew each other.

I'm not sure if I'm right about this, so I offer it only as an idea. The other point on the side of both Praxis/Action types was that the social crisis of the 1960s fundamentally was about the War and not about the working class. I think they shot themselves in the foot by deliberately alienating much of the white working class in particular but the crisis in America was not similar to France 68 as the LC claimed.

As a Trotskyist Triffinite, LaRouche did believe with some reason that the system was headed for a breakdown crisis but obviously when the Bretton Woods System did collapse in 1971, it didn't lead to the total collapse of the system and a return to the 1930s. But LaRouche was wrong; not totally crazy. So, again, on paper the model the LC put forth was pretty sophisticated. It just happened to be wrong.

But like you and I faced only with the choice between choosing between Praxis or Action Faction or the Trot sects or the CP or PL, I would have chosen the LC no doubt about it. At the time, it seemed to combine the best of the Old Left with the New Left. But it is also very interesting to read other group's attacks on the LC.

I think this is today most important to understand why we all froze up during Mop Up instead of leaving. Beside the fact that we were lied to and Mop-Up was presented as something the entire NEC had agreed upon which we now know was untrue, the core loyalties of the LC "old guard" had been formed in the period 1966-March 1973. Even the NU-WRO organizing goes back to 1966-67 in a way.

To simply walk out in April 1973 would have been to say somehow that all the core identity he had to the "old" LC was somehow wrong and this proved psychologically impossible for most members, including me. And the ideas we had were that we were the best thing to come out of the New Left. So faced with this sense of personal identity, it was just mentally impossible to walk away especially given that in Mop-Up, the entire survival of the organization seemed at stake once violence was introduced.

What we couldn't grasp that "Mop-Up" really was the destruction of the old LC and not the CP. We were too deeply converted from the entire experience of 1966-72 and the belief that we were right and morons like Rudd or the morons at PL were wrong. But I'm sure Rudd had the same sense and the PL types also saw themselves as the real revolutionary deal while to both of them the LC looked kind of wimpy.

But I think you can't understand 1973-74 without getting the fact that the real loyalty to the LC came from the sense that from 1966-73, we were far more right than wrong. So the idea that the LC had somehow one day just fallen off a cliff seemed impossible to grasp both intellectually and emotionally. After all, hadn't we spent all those years being the "anti-crazies"?

### **“PARANOIA STRIKES DEEP”: NEW YORK CITY SUMMER 1968 – The New Mole Files Gets Nervous**

---

A famous song lyric from the 1960s goes: “Paranoia strikes deep/Into your heart it will creep.” By the summer of 1968, SDS was rife with fears that a sophisticated CIA plot was underway to manipulate the organization even as in New York City the Lindsay Administration furiously tried to “co-opt” the radical movement.

As the old saying goes, “Even paranoids have enemies.”

The first devastating revelation of CIA involvement in the student left came in February 1967. *Ramparts* magazine revealed that for some 15 years the CIA had been secretly financing the liberal National Student Association's international programs through the Agency's “Covert Action Division 5.” By the summer of 1968 new rumors were sweeping SDS that the CIA was yet again trying to infiltrate the organization.

## TAKING CARE OF BUSINESS?

In *The Strawberry Statement* -- James Simon Kunen's book about Columbia in 1968 -- he reports on a briefing he heard at the Columbia Liberation School about the just concluded SDS Convention in East Lansing, Michigan:

"Also at the convention, men from Business International Roundtable -- the meetings sponsored by Business International for their client groups and heads of government -- tried to buy a few radicals. . . . These are the guys who wrote the Alliance for Progress. They're the left wing of the ruling class. They agreed with us on black control and student control. They were for kicking out [Columbia U. President] Kirk. Only thing they disagreed with us on was imperialism. They figure we've got the technology the world needs, and we ought to have some control over where it goes and for what.

"They want McCarthy in [RFK having just been murdered -- HH]. They see fascism as the threat, see it coming from Wallace. The only way McCarthy could win is if the crazies and young radicals act up and make Gene look more reasonable. They offered to finance our demonstrations in Chicago. We were offered Esso (Rockefeller) money. They want to make a lot of radical commotion so they can look more in the center as they move to the left."

Kunen assumed that "Esso" must mean the Esso oil company. But Esso also stood for the East Side Service Organization (ESSO), which was active in the Lower East Side. As we have seen in an earlier NMF, the "chairman of the board" of ESSO was none other than Abbie Hoffman, who at the time was extensively involved in organizing the Chicago protests.

## RAVENS OR PIGEONS?

In his recent memoir *Ravens in the Storm*, former SDS President Carl Oglesby discusses his negotiations with Eldredge Haynes, the head of Business International, as well as Oglesby's failed attempt to persuade SDS to work with the "left wing" of the ruling elite. Oglesby first met Haynes at the Gotham Hotel in New York in the spring of 1968: "He was a Harvard man. He had spent much of his career in the Foreign Service but had left government during the Kennedy years to become a consultant to businesses operating in the 'frequently turbulent' countries of the Third World. This work had grown into Business International, Inc. CIA, right?"

The next day Oglesby took part in a roundtable presentation about SDS to a select group that included executives from GM, GE, AT&T, IBM, Ford, the AP and even "a man from the State Department." Two weeks later, Oglesby helped organize another dialog between BI clients and "half a dozen SDSers from Columbia and CCNY. . . . SDS groups without me continued these meetings, sitting down with BI people four times that spring. . . . Haynes and I kept meeting. A little later that same spring, Haynes popped the big question. 'Suppose Robert Kennedy were to become a presidential candidate.

Do you imagine, Carl, that SDS might be inclined to support him?”

Oglesby then explains: “I must confess, too, that I’d been scared of [SDS] heavy-metal politics from the beginning . . . My fears of SDS’s leftward inclinations were strengthened by my sense, as of the BI meetings, that an alternative to a politics of rage was within our reach, and that it was essential that we choose it. . . . There was no way for us to achieve our objectives, I thought, without at some point establishing a sotto voce relationship with mainstream grown-ups.”

Clearly Haynes had chosen his first big SDS contact well.

Oglesby later relates a conversation he had with Bernadine Dohrn who like the vast majority of SDS members strongly opposed any SDS alliance with BI, “sotto voce” or not. Although Oglesby says that he told Dohrn that even if “Haynes or the CIA has a secret agenda, I believe it’s not to screw us up but to use us in some way to help make RFK president.” Dohrn replied: “Well, it could be both, couldn’t it? . . . You say this BI’s thing is to gather intelligence on Third World countries and sell it to the guys you once denounced as corporate imperialists. I don’t understand you, Carl. It seems like you talk one way and act another.” According to Oglesby, Dohrn “was probably right in assuming that BI and Haynes were tied to Kennedy and very possibly to the CIA. . . . But who cared? As far as I was concerned, the more the CIA knew about SDS, the better. We had nothing to hide!”

### **MAYOR’S MAN WITH BANKERS’ PLAN?**

The idea that the “Liberal Establishment” was actively trying to manipulate and subvert the radical movement played an absolutely critical role in the group’s analysis of the Columbia Strike. The strike had suffered its first critical setback when successful negotiations between the Administration and the black students prevented the protest from spreading deeper into Harlem. During the negotiations, Dr. Kenneth Clark, a leading psychology professor at CUNY, personally intervened to steer the black students in a less confrontational direction. As it so happened, Clark’s Metropolitan Applied Research Center (MARC) had been established in 1967 with a direct grant from the Ford Foundation.

In his history of the Columbia Strike published in the 20 January 1971 *New Solidarity*, Tony Papert writes: “Ford’s Dr. Kenneth Clark was addressing the black demonstrators as follows: ‘We blacks have to look out for ourselves. University discipline has a different meaning for us from what it has for the white students. If Whitey has to leave school for a while, he can pick up a draft deferment and go to work for this father’s firm – but there’s nothing for us but the army and a demeaning menial job. It would mean the end of your career.’” Papert then comments: “Clark succeeded in keeping Hamilton [Hall, which the black students occupied] from taking its Strike Committee seat, and leading it into separate negotiations with the administration.”

Nor was the idea that the New York white elites were actively engaged in “co-opting”

potential troublemakers tin-foil hat conspiracy mongering. In 1975, Doubleday published *The Mayor's Man*, by a former top aide to Mayor Lindsay named Barry Gottehrer. Gottehrer documents the extraordinary efforts John Lindsay's administration took to buy off potential troublemakers particularly in the black community. That effort included Gottehrer's "unabashed trafficking with people he knew were hoodlums and criminals, never once tipping off the police," Steven Weisman noted in his 16 March 1975 *New York Times* review of *The Mayor's Man*.

Gottehrer and another Lindsay aide named Sid Davidoff operated with seeming *carte blanche* from the mayor. Time and time again they showed little hesitation when it came to overriding the decisions of the official police department bureaucracy on highly sensitive issues.

Gottehrer, in effect, became the front man for a major effort by the Lindsay Administration to combine intelligence gathering, the cultivation of extensive informant networks, and specially targeted social welfare and social service programs to keep the city calm. Every day Gottehrer produced "The Crisis Calendar," a document on potential city trouble spots that was so secret it was only seen by three people. His effort was supported by the New York police department's top secret "Red Squad" known as BOSSI, the Bureau of Special Services and Investigations. In *The Mayor's Man*, Gottehrer candidly writes that "the local task forces were passing on more information than we had staff to handle, the police and BOSSE [sic] (the Bureau of Special Services, the undercover police unit) were providing even more . . ."

## **ALLAH AND THE MAU MAUS**

Gottehrer especially became a bag man of sorts to an incredibly motley crew of street corner black nationalists that included a former Black Muslim named Clarence 13X Smith who had renamed himself "Allah." Allah founded and controlled the "Five Percenters" quasi-gang/quasi-religious cult centered in Harlem. Gottehrer's spending of both city money and private funds on the Five Percenters helped Allah expand its hold over ghetto youth especially after the city began financing free bus trips to the beach and free plane rides over the city to members of the group. Gottehrer even used the Urban League to create a "street academy" in the heart of Harlem which functioned as a Five Percenter clubhouse. For their part, the fanatical Five Percenters help suppress any riots in Harlem after the assassination of Doctor Martin Luther King.

Gottehrer also developed close ties to Charles 37X Kenyatta and his tiny band of machete-wielding "Harlem Mau Maus." He even maintained a working relationship with a quasi-Harlem mob connected Black Nationalist street corner preacher named James Lawson – who once petitioned the city for funds to run his own "counter-activist" intelligence operation in the ghetto. Gottehrer also kept in close touch with a number of non-Manhattan-based black nationalists that included Brooklyn's Sonny Carson.

In *The Mayor's Man*, Gottehrer argues that his approach to keeping the peace was far more sophisticated than anything the Federal Government put forward. He writes that

the Johnson administration established the “Community Relations Services” under the auspices of the Department of Justice. Its sole purpose appears to have been to finance informer networks in the ghetto. Gottehrer, however, stressed that the city’s program was far better since it coordinated information gathering with various civil service attempts to improve the neighborhood as well as serve as a buffer between the “community” and the police.

Gottehrer also makes no secret of the fact that the Lindsay administration considered the local black political establishment in Harlem hopelessly corrupt. The Lindsay administration instead decided to establish connections with “street” types like Allah to go around the old Harlem Democratic Party machine. Gottehrer writes: “Percy Sutton, Manhattan borough president and the most prominent black in city government, was put out that we weren’t turning to him to act as broker between the Lindsay administration and the black community. . . . I wasn’t so sure that these [black establishment] leaders would come out to help us. I made up my mind not to risk such a meeting again, but to concentrate on neighborhoods and bypass the traditional power brokers.”

Harlem’s key political power broker was Adam Clayton Powell. Through his political connections, Powell managed to get his friend Livingston Wingate to control the Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited-Associated-Community Teams (HARYOU-ACT), yet another federally-funded poverty program. Gottehrer writes dismissively of HARYOU: “Many of the people that were to give us trouble in the next few years were street-corner speakers, and most . . . also had some connection with HARYOU-ACT, the black anti-poverty program. Adam Clayton Powell had pushed the poverty legislation through his House Education and Labor Committee and then sought to control its biggest single program – HARYOU-ACT – by bringing in Livingston Wingate, whose ties with Powell ran back over years, named its executive director. Powell used HARYOU as a source of patronage, and, before long, it became his own sprawling political bureaucracy above Ninety-Sixth Street.” (HARYOU-ACT was actually the merger of Clark’s original HARYOU with Powell’s own ACT.)

Powell’s ally Wingate managed to force the first chairman of HARYOU and the man who really helped design the initial program to step down. This was none other than Dr. Kenneth Clark. By setting up MARC with Ford Foundation money on the one hand and trying to develop independent Harlem connections outside the control of the local Democratic Harlem establishment, the “reformers” attacked the established Harlem machine led by Powell and Percy Sutton, who were seen as the black version of the old Tammany Hall machine.

For the Labor Committee, there was a direct link between the Ford Foundation-funded Dr. Kenneth Clark and the ravings of Allah. They were seen as part of a sophisticated “counter-insurgency” classic “divide and conquer” plot by the rich white capitalist elite to consciously develop fake radical movements (later dubbed “countergangs”) which they funded and controlled to divide any potential opposition along racial and ethnic lines.

**YIPPIE!**

In *The Mayor's Man*, Gottehrer also candidly discusses his covert attempts to fund Abbie Hoffman and his Yippies. Hoffman, Jerry Rubin and their friend Jim Fourrat were paid \$100 a week from the Lower East Side Youth Council, a subsidiary of Gottehrer's Urban Action Task Force.

At one point, however, Gottehrer decided he wanted to fund Hoffman more directly through what we now know as ESSO. Gottehrer says that he wanted Hoffman to write a pamphlet on free services for street people but that "I didn't want the cost to show up on my books. I worked out an elaborate arrangement with the minister of a church in Greenwich Village [almost certainly the Judson Memorial Church mentioned in Osha Neumann's memoirs – HH]. I agreed to pay a certain amount of money from our private [i.e., foundation and corporate donated – HH] funds to what we described very generally as a publication, the church sub-contracted the project out to a writer and then had it printed. I paid the church and the church paid all the bills. The deal was arranged around the premise that the writer would be Abbie." The paperwork organization used to cover the money exchanges was ESSO, the East Side Service Organization.

Hoffman's opus – famously entitled *F\*\*\* the System* -- helped make him a national celebrity at the same time the Yippies and Jeff Shero's *RAT* were encouraging massive attendance at the 1968 Democratic Convention. (*RAT* even published a Chicago tour guide for potential protestors.) Given all this, the idea that the "Esso" reported in Kunen's book was really Hoffman's East Side Service Organization and not the Esso oil company seems far more plausible.

### **"PLAYING GOD IN THE GHETTO": THE FORD FOUNDATION AND SCHOOL DECENTRALIZATION**

In his 2001 book *The Ungovernable City: John Lindsay and His Struggle to Save New York*, Vincent Cannato takes a critical look at both Gottehrer and Lindsay. He notes that Gottehrer had begun his operations in the summer of 1967 with the "Summer Task Force" that became the Urban Action Task Force. From Cannato: "The purpose of the Urban Action Task Force was riot prevention." The Summer Task Force was funded in part by the blue-blood Citizens Summer Committee headed by Tomas Hoving with corporate donors like Union Carbide, Chemical Bank, Chase Manhattan, Mobile Oil and Metropolitan Life ostensibly to help "urban youth." When the Summer Task Force became the full-time Urban Action Task Force it continued to receive outside funding from wealthy donors.

Sometime in April 1967, Gottehrer reports that Lindsay approached the Ford Foundation's new director McGeorge Bundy and asked him to draw up a "decentralization plan" for the New York school system. Cannato adds: "In March 1967, a group calling themselves the Citizens Committee for Decentralization of the Public Schools was formed. The executive committee of the group, headed by Robert Sarnoff, the president of RCA and a trustee of the Whitney Museum, read like a 'who's who' of elite new York, including Thomas Watson Jr., chairman of IBM; James Linen, president



of Time, Inc.: and James B. Conant, former president of Harvard University. In the fall of 1968, the Urban Coalition came out with its own full-page ad in the *Times* proclaiming: 'If you give a damn about our children, we see only one answer. Community control of the schools.' . . . Epitomizing elite opinion in New York was the Ford Foundation, headed by McGeorge Bundy. The foundation gave over \$900,000 to fund the community control experiment in 1967 and 1968. . . . At the time, Diane Ravitch criticized the Ford Foundation for 'playing God in the ghetto.'"

### **ALBERT SHANKER : A "TERRIBLE TERRIBLE MAN"?**

But if the Ford Foundation was now playing God, was American Federation of Teachers (AFT) leader Albert Shanker now the Devil? Gottehrer called Shanker "a terrible, terrible person" while John Lindsay – who labeled Shanker "an evil man" – so personally despised Shanker that he banned him from Gracie Mansion's private living quarters.

The unlikely target of patrician wrath, Albert Shanker had been a politically active Socialist since his youth, and he marched for civil rights in Selma, Alabama, in 1965. Shanker also was a leading labor member of Norman Thomas's Second-International allied Socialist Party (SP). During the teachers strike, the SP fought what they saw as an obvious attempt by the Lindsay administration to break the union.

Nor was the AFT's suspicion of Lindsay particularly unique. *New York Times* labor reporter A. H. Raskin reported that by the end of 1968, "Many – and probably most – of the top leaders in local labor" were "genuinely convinced that Lindsay despises them and that his aim is to 'bust' unions in the municipal service."

SP leader Michael Harrington – author of the famous book *The Other America* –spoke for many when he argued: "John Lindsay has not once given the slightest hint that he has any sympathy for, or understanding of, unionism. He has botched every negotiation he has handled, in part because he is so obviously contemptuous of organized workers. He is capable of a charismatic relationship to the under-organized ghetto, but not of any on-going participation in collective bargaining." Harrington called the Urban Coalition ad in support of community control in the fall of 1968 "the most obscene act of Machiavellianism on the part of white corporate wealth in recent years." *New York Daily News* columnist Jimmy Breslin, however, defended Lindsay and accused Shanker of being "an accent away from George Wallace" while Murry Kempton described Shanker as a "goon" and "law-breaker."

### **COLUMBIA SDS – ENTER "LYNN MARCUS"**

The larger social crisis in both national SDS and in New York City politics would be mirrored inside the New York radical movement and no more intensely than on the Columbia campus all that summer. In "Sundial: Columbia SDS Memories" about the Columbia strike and radical micro-politics in New York in the late 1960s, Bob Feldman vividly recaptures the debates inside SDS that critical summer.

(<http://bfeldman68.blogspot.com/>)

Feldman is no admirer of the Labor Committee. In fact, Feldman rather idolizes failed mass murderer Ted Gold, a Columbia activist from a Red Diaper family. Gold turned to RYM I/Weatherman and in 1970 he blew himself up in the famous “Townhouse explosion.” Feldman’s other hero was a more successful murderer, Dave Gilbert. Then a praxis-inspired activist and radical pacifist, Gilbert is now serving a life sentence for his role in the Nyack, New York, Brinks’ botched robbery.

Given his obvious hatred of the Labor Committee, Feldman’s memoirs are remarkably restrained and well worth reading. Here Feldman describes the Labor Committee’s “Tony” (Tony Papert) and his friend Lyndon:

“Tony [Papert] suddenly had great prestige in Columbia SDS circles, despite his PL background and left-sectarian record of the previous 2 years, because he had helped hold the Low Library student rebels together and had won the respect of newly-politicized hippie-type undergraduates, for a while.

“As a result of Tony’s influence, Labor Committee head ‘Lynn Marcus’ and his cult members were invited to speak to Strike Committee-sponsored workshops on the South Lawn of the campus. ‘Lynn Marcus’ was apparently a former SWP member of the 1950s who apparently worked for some Wall Street firm in the 1960s. In spring 1968, he projected himself as a Marxist revolutionary socialist in the Rosa Luxemburg tradition. He pushed the line that the student strike at Columbia should quickly be expanded into a mass strike in New York City. When the French Student Revolt of May 1968 began to spread rapidly and attract the support of young French industrial workers, after the students battled with French cops in Paris’s Latin Quarter a few days after the Columbia bust, ‘Marcus’’s proposed political strategy did not seem unrealistic.”

### **MAN WEIRD WITH BEARD**

In *The Strawberry Statement*, James Simon Kunen provides an eyewitness account (135-40) of a very late July or early August 1968 Liberation School debate. From *The Strawberry Statement*: “Then there was a debate between Papert for the Labor Committee and Rudd and a [Dave] Gilbert for the action faction.” The debate soon turned to Gilbert’s praxis-driven “underconsumption” theory. In the middle of it, “a very erudite and aged-looking fellow with a beard and everything” spoke. Although Kunen clearly had no clue to just who the “very erudite” fellow actually was, it is clearly LaRouche (“L. Marcus”).

At the debate LaRouche peddled his Robert Triffin-inspired take on the imminent end of capitalism, telling the assembled audience, “But if the banks had stayed open two more days in the gold crisis, we’d all have been in the midst of a world depression. If you subscribe to the underconsumption theory . . . there is no crisis. But there is a crisis.”

LaRouche’s then common-law wife Carol also made an appearance in Kunen’s text where she tested out some of the idea that would later appear in “New Left, Local

Control, and Fascism”: “A woman teacher, who hangs around fulfilling everyone’s mother need, spoke ominously for a moment: ‘To be against the system is not enough. Mussolini came from the left that way. Hitting the streets is not enough.’”

### **FIGHTING WITH THE “MARCUS CULT”**

Bob Feldman recalls that inside the Columbia SDS chapter: “Most of ‘Marcus’s’ followers were ex-PL people (like Tony) who had followed Tony out of PL and had apparently been meeting with ‘Marcus’ for at least 6 months before the April 1968 Columbia Revolt. Marcus’s’ SDS Labor Committee—like PL—saw the New Left SDS as a mass-based umbrella, within which they could operate as an external cadre and from which they could recruit new organizers to hand out leaflets to a U.S. industrial working class which, they argued, was ripe for revolution.”

Throughout that summer, both the LC and PL fought both for the “praxis” syndicalists and Rudd’s action faction.

Again from Feldman’s memoirs:

“Another reason why Columbia SDS people couldn’t prevent the Columbia Administration from reopening the University in Fall 1968 was that both the Labor Committee and PL each flooded the Columbia scene with at least 10 of their dogmatic members. The Labor Committee and PL sectarians were able to drag the chapter into lengthy sectarian debates and faction fights that demoralized and turned off many returning veterans of the spring revolt, as well as new members. Instead of being able to spend SDS mass meeting time figuring out ways to more effectively mobilize Barnard and Columbia students to confront the trustees, much of the mass meeting time had to be spent with Columbia New Left activists exposing the inadequacies of the politically sectarian proposals of the Labor Committee people—who were acting as external cadre for Lyndon LaRouche/Lynn Marcus’s’ cult group, within Columbia’s SDS chapter.”

### **THE UFT STRIKE: “A REACTIONARY RACIST ACTION”?**

Although the LC hadn’t quite yet earned “cult group” status -- thank you very much -- its views of the teacher’s strike did not sit well with Feldman’s wing of Columbia SDS and Ted Gold in particular. Again from Feldman’s memoirs:

“In Fall 1968, the Albert Shanker-led United Federation of Teachers [UFT] struck in order to try to sabotage any Board of Education plans to concede control of NYC public schools in the Black community to African-American community control boards. New Left SDS people supported the demand of African-American activists for community control of their neighborhood schools, seeing it as a just demand for Black self-determination, and defined the UFT strike as a reactionary, racist action. PL and Labor Committee members within SDS chapters, however, supported the UFT strike and argued that it represented a justified struggle of labor against Ford Foundation and white corporate establishment-sponsored ‘bourgeois black nationalism.’

“PL and Labor Committee people within SDS chapters also opposed New Left SDS people on the issue of fighting for open admissions to places like Columbia and CUNY for African-American, Puerto Rican and white working-class people. New Left SDS people argued that it was democratic to demand that open admissions be established in the ‘bourgeois university.’ PL and Labor Committee people, however, charged that it was reactionary to fight for open admissions to the ‘bourgeois university’ because, once admitted, the African-American, Puerto Rican and white working-class students would ‘become bourgeoisified.’ [A *bold summary to say the least* – HH.]

Within Columbia SDS, the ideological division between the white New Left response to the UFT strike and the open admissions demand and the PL/Labor Committee response led to more demoralizing faction-fighting throughout the fall. But off-campus, Teachers for a Democratic Society [TDS] members, led by Ted [Gold], taught in African-American-controlled ‘freedom schools’ during the UFT strike.”

### **THE CURIOUS CASE OF PL**

Bob Feldman stresses the widely despised PL’s presence at Columbia which he tries to link to the Labor Committee. PL cadre -- including Dennis King -- did try to interject themselves into the Columbia debates. Yet PL hated the Labor Committee and viewed it as a potential serious rival both politically and ideologically.

PL organizing had taken an enormous hit during the strike; the head of Columbia PL, Tony Papert, effectively broke with the leadership of his own organization. Yet during some of the most critical days of the Columbia protest that spring, Papert begged PL to mobilize its Harlem organization in particular to effectively spread the strike off campus. Then PLP Vice President Bill Epton -- who had emerged as a local folk hero during the 1964 protests against police brutality -- led PL’s organization in Harlem. PL even had an office on Lenox Avenue near 126th Street, where a PL member named Larry Phelps was brutally stabbed to death in early 1965.

If PL mobilized its considerable resources to spread the strike, it could have had enormous consequences. Yet for some unknown reason, it chose not to.

In his memoirs of the Columbia Strike published in the 20 January 1971 issue of *New Solidarity*, Papert writes: “although strike-leader Papert retained his membership in Progressive Labor, PL policies played no role in the leadership of the Columbia strike. Papert asked PLP Vice-President and top black leader William Epton to help organize strike support in Harlem. Epton replied with two revealing excuses: first, ‘It sounds like white students want to use black people as battering rams again’; second, ‘No one in Harlem is interested in Columbia.’”

To me, at least, Epton’s excuse as reported by Papert made little sense. The entire struggle at Columbia, after all, largely revolved around the University’s planned gym expansion into Harlem. Epton also was a personal friend of Jim Haughton who was then

a member of the editorial board of the *Campaigner*.

In his book on LaRouche, Dennis King reports that when Papert first rose to prominence during the Columbia Strike, “PLP’s national leaders” thought that the strike “would become a PLP triumph, strengthening its hand within SDS nationally.” However, “when the PLP leadership tried to give further instructions to their Columbia club, they discovered that LaRouche had most of the leverage.” Yet none of this explains why PL actively opposed Papert’s effort to bring Bill Epton into the fray, a move that would have only put PLP into the national spotlight.

PL’s reaction to the teachers strike proved equally strange.

PL’s paper *Challenge* echoed the Labor Committee’s views of community control as being a kind of ruling class plot. In a September 1968 *Challenge* article, PL attacked a fiery black preacher, the Reverend Galamison, who had directly received some \$160,000 straight from Ford’s coffers for his own “School and Community Organization for Partnership in Education” (SCOPE). *Challenge* wrote: “The Ford Foundation was set up as a supposed ‘independent and neutral’ source of funds for ‘worthy’ educational activities. However, it ‘just so happens’ that this foundation is run by some of the biggest bankers and industrialists in the U.S., and it gets its funds from the same sources. These leaders of American capitalism are not giving away their money in order to help people overcome the oppressive conditions which the American ruling class created in the first place. . . . They know what they’re paying for: they want these funds used to water-down and dissipate the people’s struggles.”

During the teachers strike, however, PL attacked the UFT even as it took active measures to try and cripple the Labor Committee, which they clearly saw as a potential serious rival unlike the praxis syndicalists or Rudd’s “action faction” crazies.

Although Feldman’s portrayal of the LC and PL may be right up to a point, starting in September 1968, PL allied both with “praxis” and the Ruddite Luddites to “expel” the Labor Committee-led SDS Regional Labor Committee from SDS over the Labor Committee’s critical support for the UFT. PL in fact actually led the campaign to get the SDS Regional Labor Committee abolished so PL could set up its own “Worker-Student Alliance” in its place under SDS auspices.

### **“POLICE SOCIALISM IN NEW YORK”?**

As both James Simon Kunen and Bob Feldman document, on the eve of the New York City teachers strike, the Labor Committee had emerged as a significant presence inside New York SDS, even as PL slipped deeper into its own self-made web of dialectical confusion.

During the Columbia strike, the Labor Committee faction also had seen up close and personal the way the black students had been skillfully separated from the rest of the Columbia strikers by liberal black establishment figures like Clark. Columbia SDS LC

leaders like Tony Papert and Steve Komm also could testify to the Ford Foundation's blatant attempts to divide "moderate" white students from the radicals by co-opting student syndicalism. Such experiences later would be analyzed in a December 1968 N. Y. Labor Committee statement entitled "'Police Socialism' in New York":

"What is the actual composition of the 'community control' movement in this city? An analysis of some obvious facts gives insight into the way in which the CIA-style counterinsurgency works abroad as well as in the U.S. itself.

"The vanguard of this movement is supplied by the largest 'radical' organization in New York City: not the CP, or the SWP or SDS, but the government-created and controlled 'poverty' movement, with the largest number of full-time paid 'radical' organizers ever turned loose in one area in political history. This movement is composed of two layers of activists. The first is made up of the full-time black and white 'radical' poverty organizers working in behalf of local control in the seemingly infinite variety of 'poverty' projects sponsored by foundations and government. The second is made up from the dozen or so local 'activists' organized by each organizer. Recent demonstrations suggest that this movement amounts to about 2000 'activists' of both types throughout the city.

"This sort of 'radical' organization has a name in the history books. That name is 'police socialism,' signifying the sort of mass 'radical' movements organized by various secret police agencies in previous European history. The most frequently-cited examples are the movements organized under the Czar by Okhrana agents Colonel Zubatov and Father Gapon. It should be noted that Hitler got his start in 'radical' politics as a secret agent for the German Army and that Mussolini's fascist movement rose to power as a government-subsidized movement of anarchist strike-breakers.

"Beginning with the Kennedy Administration, U.S. Imperialists have thoroughly co-opted Tom Hayden's ERAP community-organizing chimera, with the result that virtually the entire organized movement within the ghetto, except for tiny independent groups like SNCC and the Panthers, are controlled, lock-stock-and-barrel by government agencies. CORE, for example, has become in effect a branch of the domestic CIA. During recent years no ghetto leader could produce any 'marketable' commodity, that is, a sizeable following, without being offered a lucrative job and a pork-barrel for his friends on some 'poverty' program. Substantial numbers of white 'radical' organizers have sold their political souls in the same way.

"The result has been that any independent radical group considering united action with an available organized force has had to deal with foundations or government paid organizers. Consequently, outside the anti-war movement proper, government intervention in the radical movement has put 'local control' as a political ideology on the order of the day, successfully corrupting most of the independent groupings of the New Left. It's one of the slickest pieces of co-option ever attempted and pulled off by a capitalist government."

If yet more proof was needed of the Ford Foundation's "counterinsurgency" role, the

Ford Foundation blatantly intervened at Columbia to split not just blacks but “moderate” white students away from the radicals by openly funded the liberal “Students for a Restructured University.” Ed Schwartz -- who held the dubious distinction of being the first president of the National Student Association right after its CIA funding was disclosed – proudly recalls in his book *Will the Revolution Succeed?* that as NSA president “I would walk into the Ford Foundation literally off the streets, direct from participation in some of the events at Columbia University. There I would complete negotiations on a \$315,000 grant designed to encourage student-initiated projects in educational change.”

Bob Feldman also notes: “During the summer, however, some of these less radical strike committee students ended up splitting off from the Columbia Strike Committee, accepting Ford Foundation money and (according to de-classified documents) even apparently acting as FBI informants, at the same time they formed the ‘Students For A Restructured University.’”

To Labor Committee cadre, the Columbia strike and its aftermath proved the case against both student syndicalism and “local control” as sophisticated “liberal counterinsurgency” actions funded by some of the wealthiest and most sophisticated members of the capitalist ruling class.

## CONCLUSION

Did Dr. Kenneth Clark wake up every day delighted in the knowledge that he was aiding a Ford Foundation Plot against the Black Community?

Did Rhody McCoy take delight in his role in aiding a massive CIA orchestrated conspiracy?

Needless to say, neither Kenneth Clark nor Rhody McCoy nor the parents of poor children trying to insure they had a better life for one second saw themselves as witting participants in a vast “Liberal CIA”-backed “counterinsurgency” plot. For someone like Doctor Clark, the fact that a prestigious an institution like the Ford Foundation under McGeorge Bundy would become involved in trying to restructure the New York City school system was a sign that at least some of the bastions of the white power establishment that ruled America were finally starting to listen.

Yet by the same token, few AFT teachers would accept the notion that they were evil white racists dedicated to holding back the advance of poor black children or that Albert Shanker was New York’s new George Wallace.

In short, the gap between the Labor Committee’s claims and reality were considerable. Still there was arguably considerable truth in what the Labor Committee claimed.

Whatever one ultimately makes of the events in question, by the summer of 1968 the Labor Committee had come out of nowhere into a position of some prominence. in

“Right Face, Left Face: The Columbia Strike,” Samuel Hays study of the strike first published in the June 1969 *Political Science Quarterly*, he reports that the Columbia Liberation School became an intense ground for struggle over the future of SDS. Here, for example, “Paul Rockwell and Tony Papert argued for the position of the New York SDS Labor Committee against the ‘new working class’ tendencies. Their development of a well-formulated position was one of the major New Left innovations in the summer of 1968. By the fall they had become a major source of opposition to the ‘new working class’ element in Columbia SDS; they supported the Teachers Union and opposed community control in the teachers strike on the grounds of the dangers of decentralization, and this in direct opposition to SDS leadership.”

To fully understand the intensity of the debate and just how it was possible that the proto-Labor Committee and the proto-Weatherman cults could both simultaneously emerge from the same cauldron, it must always be kept in mind that to the initiates seemingly abstract debates about political theory and tactics had an almost sacred meaning. The debates at Columbia Liberation School over the future of SDS took part in the wake of the Columbia Strike, the earlier assassination of Martin Luther King and the riots that swept American cities in its wake, the May mass strikes in Paris, the assassination of Robert F. Kennedy, the rise of the George Wallace movement, and the nights of riots outside the Democratic Party convention in Chicago.

No longer did LaRouche’s classes on Marxist economics seem quite so abstract and academic.

For the Labor Committee, the experiences at Columbia fighting the Ford Foundation offered text-book proof of LaRouche’s ideas in *Third Stage of Imperialism* about the key role being played by “liberal” banking elites. Recall that when the speaker at Columbia’s Liberation School discussed the overtures by Business International and its clients to SDS in the meeting that James Simon Kunen attended, he said: “These are the guys who wrote the Alliance for Progress. They’re the left wing of the ruling class. They agreed with us on black control and student control. They were for kicking out [Columbia U. President] Kirk. Only thing they disagreed with us on was imperialism.”

Two not utterly dissimilar versions of this basic view could be found in *Third Stage of Imperialism* and in Carl Oglesby’s essays on the “Yankees and Cowboys” first published in the *Guardian* that spring.

For the Labor Committee, the Ford Foundation’s actions in New York were linked to its promotion of the Alliance for Progress against Castro or “best and brightest” McGeorge Bundy’s work in developing counter-insurgency doctrine in Vietnam as National Security Advisor to both the Kennedy and Johnson administrations from 1961 to 1966 before taking over the Ford Foundation. In short, both Columbia and the subsequent teachers strike would drive home the message to Labor Committee members that “liberals” were, if anything, the radical movement’s most dangerous enemies.

This deep hatred and suspicion of liberalism first fully developed during the Columbia



Strike continues to inform the cult's politics and practices today.

**(TO BE CONTINUED)**

**RESEARCH NOTES: RAM**

One of Barry Gottehrer's most murky connections was to the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM). In his 1969 campaign against John Lindsay, the Democratic candidate Mario Procaccino --who first made famous the term "limousine liberal" as a forerunner to Tom Wolfe's "radical chic" -- claimed that the Lindsay administration was putting men with criminal records on the payroll. As it so happened, some of these men were tied to RAM, the Revolutionary Action Movement, a black radical group accused of trying to blow up the Statue of Liberty.

From Vincent Cannato's *The Ungovernable City*:

"Procaccino's charge was based on an internal police department memo that named seven young men who operated the Malcolm X Cultural Center in Corona, Queens, where they worked 'with the hard core youths of the area in an attempt to make them useful citizens.' . . . The memo charged that the money, as well as the rent for the storefront, came from a city program and was administered by mayoral aides Barry Gottehrer and Sid Davidoff. One of the youths, Fred Fernandez, was a member of the Revolutionary Action Movement and had been arrested in 1967 on charges of planning to assassinate moderate civil rights leaders."

In June 1967, 16 members of RAM had been arrested for plotting to assassinate Roy Wilkins and Whitney Young. They were found with some 30 weapons, including one machine gun, three carbines, a dozen rifles, a machete, 1,000 rounds of ammo, police riot helmets, walkie-talkies, and 275 pounds of heroin. Their ringleader, Herman Ferguson, also doubled as an assistant principal in a Queens' high school. Their entire group had been infiltrated by a BOSSI agent.

As for the Corona Center, Cannato writes: "The Center was one of fourteen 'satellite storefronts' throughout the city affiliated with the city's Youth Services Agency, a division of the Human Resources Administration. The program also received private funding from the Urban Coalition and local businesses. During the summer of 1967, Parks Department funds paid the salaries of Fernandez and an associate. In the summer of 1968, the *New York Times* Foundation contributed \$25,000 to the Urban Coalition for funding these programs. In the fiscal year 1968-69, the Youth Services Agency spent \$1.2 million on these storefronts. In June 1969, when the storefront centers were brought permanently under HRA, the Malcolm X Center was not included. The reason, according to Gottehrer was because of 'the personnel on the payroll.' Gottehrer denied that the mayor's office had anything to do with the Malcolm X Center: 'All checks for the salaries and rent for this program have come from the Youth Board Research Institute and are signed by somebody at the Youth Services Agency,' wrote Gottehrer. Still, the city had been, in some manner, funding the Malcolm X Center and

the other satellite programs.”

In *The Mayor's Man*, Barry Gottehrer also discusses RAM leader Bob Collier, who had been the accused ring-leader of the Statue of Liberty plot this way: “Bob Collier was alternatively one of our most successful community organizers and one of our biggest worries. He was in between his arrest for plotting to blow up the Statue of Liberty and his trial as one of the Panther 21. Most recently, he was arrested on the Lower East Side for concealing a small arsenal in his apartment. I never knew how one man could be in so many places at once. These were the days when everybody in the streets was caught up in the paranoia of conspiracy of one kind or another and everybody thought everybody was ripping everybody else off. . . . So when I heard rumors that Bob Collier was working for the FBI or the CIA, it seemed possible, although no one ever confirmed it.”

For more on RAM, see Muhammad Ahmad (Maxwell Stanford, Jr.), *We Will Return in the Whirlwind: Black Radical Organizations 1960-1975*. Ahmad was a founder of RAM. Strangely, he never mentions Bob Collier's name as far as I can tell although he does make a passing reference to the Statue of Liberty “bomb plot.”

### **RESEARCH NOTE: ALLAH AND THE FIVE PERCENTERS**

On 12 June 1969 – at the height of his influence – Five Percenter founder Allah was gunned down in Harlem. Given that he had so many enemies – including countless fellow gamblers that he ripped off – it is impossible to know for sure who killed him and why. A few days earlier, however, Charles 37X Kenyatta was seriously wounded but survived a similar assassination attempt. It seems not unreasonable to think that both hits were carried out precisely because they were seen as lackeys of the Lindsay Administration. In his memoirs, Barry Gottehrer reports his sense of guilt that his actions may have led to the attacks on the two friends.

For more on Allah and the Five Percenters, see Michael Muhammad Knight, *The Five Percenters: Islam, Hip-Hop and the Gods of New York*. Allah's photo also graced the cover of a major magazine. (See Gloria Steinem and Lloyd Weaver: “Special Report: The City on the Eve of Destruction,” *New York Magazine*, 22 April 1968.) Gottehrer's memoir also includes a remarkable account of him attending a Five Percenter “Parliament” in Harlem that reads like something out of Sol Yurick's novel *The Warriors*.

### **LAROCHE: LEADER OF THE “MOUSE CRAP REVOLUTION” OR MORE BOSSI THAN USUAL?**

It is almost impossible to find anything on the internal debates inside BOSSI and the New York police department more generally as well as organizations like the FBI, CIA and the Justice Department regarding the seeming tension between traditional “Red Squad” activities and more sophisticated “counterinsurgency” actions.

Therefore it is not difficult to imagine different wings or different factions inside local and

federal police intelligence coming to radically opposite views with regard to the Labor Committee. Through FOIA disclosures, we now know that during the Columbia Strike, the FBI produced a crude leaflet entitled "The Mouse Crap Revolution" directly aimed at discrediting Tony Papert and the Labor Committee. We also know that in Philadelphia, the Red Squad launched the astonishing "bomb plot" charges against Steve Fraser in August 1969. A meeting of Philadelphia NCLC members also appears in an informant report that became public after FBI files were stolen from a local FBI office in Media Pennsylvania.

Yet it seems obvious that not every government agency must have seen the Labor Committee as a threat, especially when compared to the likes of the Weatherman or other radicals more directly connected to the Soviets, Chinese, Cuban or Vietnamese Communist Parties, not to mention home-grown anarchist advocates of violence.

We further know that sometime around 1956, LaRouche had been approached by the local office of the FBI and pressured to become an informant on the SWP. Although there is zero actual evidence that he did so, at least a potential future connection was made. It is possible that as the SDS Labor Committee became more prominent, there may have been a similar attempt by some element inside the FBI or BOSSI to develop a kind of "sotto voce" understanding with LaRouche.

If LaRouche did in some way respond favorably before 1973, it would have been because LaRouche would have imagined he was gaining "tactical advantage" over his adversaries and not because LaRouche was a conventional "police agent."

Certainly in 1973-74, to an outside observer members of the Labor Committee seemed able to avoid facing any significant jail time for the group's criminal assaults on members of the Communist Party in particular although the degree of legal difficulties specific individuals faced seemed to vary from city to city. We also know that by 1974 at the latest, the NCLC's Security Staff had no qualms when it came to passing information about the "terrorist Left" and their "CIA sponsors" to local police departments. Again the only way to fully clear up this mystery would be through the extensive declassification of FBI, CIA, military intelligence, and police department files.

### **BIG BOSSI:**

Although little is known about the history of the New York Police Department's Bureau of Special Services and Investigations (BOSSI, it was one of the most sophisticated police intelligence operations in America.

New York's "Red Squad" began in the early 1900s combating the anarchists on the Lower East Side and later played a major role in investigations of the American Communist Party. The CPUSA famously wrecked the New York City Red Squad when CP operatives trailed a suspected spy back to a police station where he went to report. It turned out that the Red Squad used this same police station for all its informants. The CP put the station under surveillance and by so doing discovered a host of Red Squad

agents. As a result of this debacle, BOSSI became extremely sophisticated and established “safe houses” all across the city. BOSSI also selected recruits right out of the police academy and trained them privately so they wouldn’t even use police slang by accident.

By the early 1960s, BOSSI was one of the most sophisticated domestic intelligence agency when it came to penetrating black radical groups in particular. This is because due to the racist policies of the FBI under Hoover, there were virtually no black FBI agents, much less trained infiltrators. BOSSI’s most famous black agent, Gene Roberts, was immortalized in a photo taken after Malcolm X was shot. Roberts rushed on stage to try to medically help Malcolm X with no success.

BOSSI agents lived incredibly dangerous lives infiltrating violent groups and arguably setting them up for future arrest. Therefore it is highly unlikely that actual BOSSI agents would waste their time and tax-payer money actively infiltrating a non-violent group like the Labor Committee. Most likely, they simply cultivated an informer network in cooperation with other agencies. Again, it is hard to tell for sure without looking at FOIA documents from the period.

For a quirky but very interesting look at BOSSI, see Tony Ulasewicz’s memoir, *The President’s Private Eye*. (“Tony U” was a former BOSSI agent who later worked as a private eye for President Nixon.)

#### **OTHER RESEARCH NOTES:**

**ON BIG BUSINESS AND SDS:** In his otherwise monumental history of SDS, Kirkpatrick Sale surprisingly fails to mention the SDS/Business International encounter even though it was written up at some length in *New Left Notes* and widely discussed. For a look at an attempt of a wealthy Cambridge, Massachusetts businessman named Ralph Hoagland to extensively fund the anti-PLP wing of Boston SDS, see “Right-Wing SDS’ers Get Loot: Cambridge Iron and Steel Inc. Exposed” in the August 1969 issue of *Progressive Labor*.

**ON BARRY GOTTEHRER:** For a long but somewhat superficial profile of Gottehrer, see Nicholas Pileggi’s essay “Barry Gottehrer’s Job is To Cool It” in the 22 September 1968 *New York Times*.

**ON TED GOLD:** See an article in the June 1969 issue of *Leviathan* entitled “Decentralization: Strategy to Reorganize the Cities.” The article’s authors are listed as “Mike Josefowicz and Ted Gold . . . organizers and members of TDS (Teachers for a Democratic Society)” as well as Beverly Leman, an editor of *Leviathan*. The article is noteworthy for its partial acceptance of the view that the Ford Foundation’s role in the New York City community control movement was nefarious. For Gold and his co-authors, “decentralization” a la the Ford Foundation/Bundy report was an attempt to manipulate genuine demands for community control for urban counter-insurgency purposes.

**ON SDS “SORELIANS”:** When LaRouche’s “New Left, Local Control and Fascism” article appeared in the September 1968 Campaigner, it did so at almost the exact same time that Irving Louis Horowitz published his essay “Radicalism and the Revolt Against Reason” in the September 1968 edition of *New Politics* (6/4). In it, Horowitz comments about “the Sorelian Left” emerging on American campuses and its addiction to action: “Fascism returns in the United States not as a right wing ideology, but almost as a quasi-leftist ideology. An ironic outcome that Sorel anticipated in his own writings when he celebrated Mussolini and Lenin as if they were really two peas in one pod.” Although I don’t know if LaRouche read the Horowitz article while working on “New Left, Local Control, and Fascism,” it is not impossible.

**ON THE ORIGINAL ISSUE OF THE CAMPAIGNER:** The first issue of *The Campaigner* appeared in February 1968. Although it was devoted to transit issues and entitled “N.Y. Transit Crisis,” the *Campaigner* from the very beginning was a project of LaRouche. In fact, it was published by “The Campaigner Association” located at 65 Morton Street. The first editorial board was listed as: Gary Nickerson (editor), Joe Carnegie (TWU), Phyllis and Bob Dillon, Paul Gallagher, Ed Spannaus, Jim Haughton (later of Harlem Fightback), Carol LaRouche, L. Marcus, Tony Chaitkin and Tom Wodetzki. The second issue of the *Campaigner* came out in March 1968 and was advertised as to be entitled “Election 68.” I have not seen this issue.

*[NOTE: THIS POST UPDATES THE EARLIER COMMENTS ON THE EARLY CAMPAGINER – HH]*

**NAME GAME:** Finally, a reader of my UAW-MF essay notes that the correct name of one of the co-authors of “The Port Authority Statement” is Gerry Tenney. I also noticed that I had misspelled “Jim Houghton” for Jim Haughton.

---

*Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 07-14-2009 at 07:10 PM.*

### **STRIKE! – This Time the New Mole Files Pulls No Punches! -- Part One**

---

*[NOTE: Given the complicated chronology, I will divide this history of the LC in the fall of 1968 into two sections. Part one will cover the factional fights at Columbia around the New York Teachers Strike in the broader context of the collapse of SDS and the rise of RYM I/Weatherman. The second part will more closely examine the Labor Committee and the UFT – HH.]*

In his 1974 “*Conceptual History of the Labor Committees*,” “L. Marcus” (Lyndon LaRouche) describes someone he claimed was “typical of literally thousands of examples.” LaRouche continues: “The individual in question was an unusually talented local Columbia University campus celebrity, who seemed to understand and agree with most of the basic theoretical material -- until suddenly one week that Fall. This person's obvious character defect was his eagerness to get to be the biggest celebrity possible in the shortest time. Our constant problem with him during the late Spring and Summer

months was that each week, at least, he would propose some elaborate scheme for taking over part of some newspaper, or getting large amounts of money for a big circulation newspaper of our own -- every week, he was going to make us all suddenly politically rich. He caved in that Fall under campus and radical pressure, refusing to associate himself with us any longer unless we stopped sabotaging the efforts of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Ford Foundation and New York's Mayor Lindsay to begin breaking municipal trade unions. He admitted that this strike-breaking, being done by most of SDS, as well as the Communist Party, Progressive Labor Party, and Socialist Workers Party was wrong; he opposed risking the possibility of cheap popularity by openly fighting against the left's strike-breaking. We were right in what we said, he admitted, but wrong in doing anything about it."

LaRouche was writing about Paul Rockwell, one of the most important radical leaders at Columbia who in the fall of 1968 was a graduate student in philosophy at Columbia. As an undergraduate, Rockwell became best known for "*The Gadfly*," his personal newsletter attacking U.S. involvement in Vietnam. As a spokesman for Columbia's Liberation School, Rockwell was quoted in a 29 June 1968 *New York Times* story explaining that the Liberation School was established "to study revolution . . . as it is practiced daily by the Vietnamese peasants and as it was practiced by the Cuban people when they overthrew Batista."

### **THE COLUMBIA STATEMENT**

From the spring to the fall of 1968, Rockwell was a leading supporter of the SDS Labor Committee although he never seems to have actually joined the sect as a "card-carrying member." On 12 September 1968, Columbia SDS endorsed "The Columbia Statement" written by Rockwell. It includes period piece gems like: "In Cuba racism and illiteracy had disappeared. In China, starvation had been conquered; in Vietnam a people's war seemed indefatigable. A period of continuous revolution had come upon us, and men all over the world began to envision the new society. World history had somehow formed the ineffable motivation of the Columbia insurrection."

Most important for our purposes, in "The Columbia Statement," Rockwell takes a few shots at Rudd's Action Faction writing, for example: "Our times, we realize, are fraught with desperate romantics, bourgeois anarchists, and moralistic individuals who, rather than build a revolutionary movement collectively, attempt to purge the body politic by some mad, dramatic act." Following LC thinking, Rockwell also went after the syndicalists: "'Participatory democracy,' 'sharing in decision-making' and 'local control' are really trade-union forms of politics applied to the University."

Rockwell fought Rudd's "action faction" not just verbally. Kirkpatrick Sale reports that on 25 September 1968, Rudd tried to push a tough guy proto-Weatherman line at an SDS conclave. "After some 15 or 20 minutes of this, Paul Rockwell, a short stocky non-Weatherman SDSer got out of his seat and moved toward the front of the room declaring that Rudd had had his turn and now he wanted to speak. Rudd took two menacing steps toward Rockwell, hulking over him, but Rockwell just barreled ahead,

slammed Rudd against the podium, pushed Rudd's fists away, and turned to face the audience. Rudd's face was a picture of stunned fear, all his rhetoric having done nothing to overcome his ingrained middle-class unfamiliarity with, and anxiety about, violence, he stood there a moment, shrugged, and then slunk off to join his friends to one side. The macho mood was dissipated; no one seems to have joined the Weather-ranks that night."

The confrontation between Rockwell and Rudd took place at an SDS meeting of some 250 students which saw Rudd's action faction argument come under harsh ideological attack. From a 28 September 1968 *New York Times* report: "A proposal by the Students for a Democratic Society urged a meeting of Columbia University students last night to shun 'terrorism, sabotage, and window-busting for the hell of it' in favor of a community economic action program." According to the Times, "the organizer and director of last night's meeting was Paul Rockwell, a graduate student of philosophy at Columbia and an SDS leader."

The meeting centered in large part on an anti-Rudd paper that stated: "It is a grave error to use an essential military tactic in a situation that is not military but social. There is an excessive fascination with guerrilla war. A military approach to a struggle is useful only when you already have won over large masses of the population. Terrorism, sabotage, gimmicks, individual acts that fool the cops, window-busting for the hell of it – all these non-mass tactics separate you from the movement. The significance of the strike was that it was a mass movement, not a minority act. We lost militarily in a sense, when we were finally hauled out of the buildings, but we won socially. We drew thousands to the side of the revolution. . . . Many of our people have romanticized the guerrilla war of Che and his comrades and applied that model to an inappropriate situation." (Everyone at the meeting knew that Rudd had visited Cuba a year earlier and was infatuated with Che Guevara.)

The *Times* report continues: "The paper went on to urge a program of community economic action that would 'get housing built here out of the rent, the interest, the surplus of Columbia. We should look at Columbia as one of the ways by which the surplus produced by a vast working population is taken away from the population and even used against them.'"

One night earlier, an SDS rally protesting the new Columbia President Cordier's alleged involvement in the overthrow of the Lumumba government drew some 500 protestors. The protest was led by Rockwell, whom the 27 September 1968 *New York Times* described as "a member of the organization's [SDS's] Labor Committee." The protest then hit the streets as it took up the cause of the eviction of elderly tenants from Morningside Heights. The police quickly flooded the area, resulting in two arrests, one being "Ed Spannaus, 25, of 14 West 82nd Street."

## **WHAT IS TO BE DONE?**

The clashes inside SDS reflected the intense debates that had gone on all that summer

in the Columbia Summer Liberation School located in the Phi Epsilon Pi fraternity house at 556 West 114th Street that the Strike Committee had rented.

The debate between Rudd and the Labor Committee also surfaced in a key SDS position paper authored by Rudd, Robby Roth, Jeff Sokolow, Lew Cole and other Columbia SDS members and portentously entitled “*What Is to Be Done?*” Social scientists Immanuel Wallerstein and Paul Starr note that this paper “contained many of the ideas that eventually became part of the Revolutionary Youth Movement position in SDS. Particularly interesting was Rudd’s belief, derived from Herbert Marcuse, that the economic demands of American workers could never become the basis for revolutionary activity.” It was also a direct attempt to counter the Labor Committee. From “*What is to be Done?*”:

“It is obvious that various segments of the working class are already in motion around issues that will become revolutionary. It is not for SDS or for the Labor Committee to put themselves forward as a quasi-vanguard party of the working class. . . . The Labor Committee does not recognize the spontaneous movement of workers as outlined above.

“To say that a problem is economic in origin is not to say how people are oppressed. The Labor Committee’s view of the world is highly mechanical: falling rate of profit crisis in underproduction, attack by the government and ruling class on workers’ standard of living which a revolutionary program should counterattack. We say that the crisis manifests itself in much more than economic ways, and that we should attack these. . . . The Labor Committee . . . wants us to apply a formula about an economic crisis and its economic manifestations to deal with this totality; theirs is a one-dimensional, mechanistic, vulgar-Marxist view of how to make a revolution. . . . The capitalist system is a system because it is not one-dimensional. . . . The Labor Committee believes, as is manifest in its program, that workers can be organized around a \$100/week minimum wage. That’s true. Labor unions have been doing this kind of organizing for years. Where is the revolutionary aspect of \$100/week? Cafeteria workers at Columbia have already won that.

“There is a difference between economic demands, such as the Labor Committee’s, and revolutionary demands which develop consciousness of the totality of capitalism – more than just economic attacks. Capitalism can grant all or most of labor’s economic demands – it’s been doing it for years – including, now, the demands of blacks. But that does not mean that the totality of oppression does not increase or that workers in Third World countries are not exploited even more. We need to develop a revolutionary perspective, not a one-dimensional economist perspective.”

*What is to be done?* includes this “Summary”: “Major disagreement with the Labor Committee.

“1) Students are neither a revolutionary class within themselves nor simply revolutionary intellectuals, as the Labor Committee would make them; they are a social group whose



needs can only be satisfied by a social revolution made in conjunction with other social groups. They can and will act, as students, and set other groups in motion.

“2) The totality of oppression – the issues people are concerned with – is more than just economic needs. . . . The Labor Committee’s view of the world is totally one-dimensional and mechanical.

“3) The task of the student movement is to listen to voices of protest that do exist in the working class and to try to act in alliance with these movements of workers wherever they exist. But it is not our intention to impose from the top, from the outside, a ‘program’ to ‘lead the masses.’ That method of organizing only shows contempt for people’s struggles and for their own ability to choose their own leaders and their own demands. It is only through their own struggles that people come to revolutionary consciousness and not through the isolated formulations of the self-proclaimed ‘thinkers’ of the movement, the Labor Committee.”

Point four of the summary is equally revealing: “Writing down a ‘socialist program,’ standing on street corners with leaflets, occasionally holding a meeting or attempting to instigate walk-outs, marches, and the mass strike will not lead to revolutionary consciousness on the part of anyone. If the Labor Committee program wins, we will be leafleting garment workers, four million subway riders, anyone we can leaflet, and hopefully leading a mass strike of angry workers armed with the correct leaflets. Also, as an afterthought, we will see that SDS consists of fifteen people and our movement is dead.”

## **TED GOLD**

For all of the anti-LC faction’s arguments – some cogent and some not – the paper was clearly defensive. The disastrous “military” confrontations so beloved by John Jacobs, a Columbia dropout and former PL member turned action faction theorist best known as “JJ,” had only angered many Columbia students. The 27 September SDS meeting chaired by Paul Rockwell was just one indication that the “Action Faction” was in deep trouble.

Yet just a month or two later, Paul Rockwell would himself suddenly break with the Labor Committee. Meanwhile the anti-LC faction inside Columbia SDS would unite to disassociate a LaRouche-dominated “Labor Committee” radical action project from Columbia SDS. To understand just why this happened, it is necessary to introduce another leading Columbia SDS member and yet another Labor Committee arch enemy named Ted Gold.

In the summer of 1968, Gold headed a Columbia Liberation School course on education. He also helped found Teachers for a Democratic Society (TDS). Although Gold taught in a private school, as soon as the teachers strike broke out on the first day of school on 9 September, Gold threw himself into supporting community control and attacking the teachers union. (The crisis dominated New York City only came to an end

on 18 November.)

A Red Diaper Baby, Ted Gold could read English and he was well aware of both PL and the LC's arguments about the Ford Foundation. Nor was Ted Gold an agent of the CIA or the Ford Foundation. He really seems to have been trying to resolve a critical debate over the future strategic orientation of SDS.

By September-October 1968, it was becoming clear that the anti-LC JJ/Rudd "Sorelians" had begun to wear out their welcome with their crazy acts of window breaking. Yet both the LC and PL mantras about a new orientation towards the working class seemed only slightly less absurd to many students, most of whom were far more concerned about getting drafted and sent to Vietnam than the plight of Hispanic garment center slaves.

PL's "Work-In" strategy that told radical students to get summer jobs in the garment center and heavy industry went over like a lead balloon. The LC's leafleting in the garment center during the summer and fall seemed only slightly less dubious in theory and probably even less effective in practice.

The LC claimed that if SDS in May at the height of the strike had thrown all its energy into the garment center's black and Hispanic workforce in particular, it could trigger a "mass strike" in that industry and beyond. Wallerstein and Starr comment: "According to a retrospective analysis of the spring rebellion by the Labor Committee, the strike was ruined because of SDS's failure to move outward and draw in new people. The Labor Committee contended that if SDS had mobilized its adherents to support New York's garment workers, for example, it could have precipitated a strike in the clothing industry and maintained the momentum of its own movement."

From a 22 January 1969 "N.Y. SDS Labor Committee" leaflet (entitled "*How the Anarchists Destroyed the Columbia Strike*") reprinted by Wallerstein and Starr:

"if it had been possible to mobilize a major portion of the 6000 strike supporters into the New York City garment center, during May, against poverty working conditions and wages there, the full and growing force of the Columbia movement could have triggered a general strike of 250,000 workers in that industry – and echoes in other industries – within a relatively brief period. That we did not accomplish that nor organize the beginnings of a city-wide rent strike does not signify that we lacked the objective potential to spread our spring movement in that way. Our shortcomings were subjective: the campus forces and their active allies were too politically 'green,' lacked the matured subjective qualifications to envisage and boldly undertake such otherwise obvious steps outward. . . .

"So, beginning in mid-May, the strike movement began to ebb – in what Marxian sociologists would regard as a lawful way. The first conspicuous reflection of that turn was the success of certain CIA-type agents in splitting the campus wing of the Strike Committee – creating the Ford Foundation's Students for a Restructured University, a

classic application of CIA techniques to the Columbia situation. This split was not the result of the cleverness of the 'CIA' agents involved, but the result of the opportunity created for the 'CIA' intervention by the combined ebb of the movement and its lack of subjective preparation."

Like the Labor Committee, Ted Gold also argued that it was necessary to mobilize students to support new outside social movements. But while PL and the LC looked to the factory for the future vanguard, Gold looked to the ghetto. When Ocean Hill-Brownsville erupted, Gold embraced the local community board in direct opposition to the AFT. A contingent from Columbia SDS led by Gold openly marched in favor of community control at a demonstration on 14 October 1968 that temporarily shut down traffic on the Brooklyn Bridge.

Gold clearly wanted to position SDS as the "left wing" of the community control movement. Nor were his views radically different from SDS's own past history. Tom Hayden's SDS ERAP project in Newark pursued a similar policy when it came to organizing.

In direct opposition to the "Old Left" "elitist" attempt to impose the vanguard party's program on the hapless masses, the New Left prided itself on encouraging the radicalization of the targeted community by focusing on issues directly related to daily lived existence. Hence a neighborhood could even be organized over an issue like more stop lights or better garbage pick-up. The role of SDS organizers in the big city ghetto was not to invent an issue arbitrarily but to enable the local residents to politically organize themselves over issues they considered important. Against the Old Left glorification of 'the working class,' the New Left arose in adherence to Columbia sociology professor C. Wright Mills' call to "overcome the labor metaphysic."

There were just a few small problems with Gold's Teachers for a Democratic Society. For starters, it openly advocated teachers crossing picket lines to teach in inner city schools. In so doing, Gold went against an almost sacred tradition inside the Left. Gold also put SDS in direct conflict not only with the AFT but with the entire trade union movement both locally and nationally.

Gold and his supporters also wound up arm-in-arm with more than a little dubious "community control" promoters like Brooklyn's Sonny Carson or Ford Foundation supported figures like Rhody McCoy than with the vast majority of the black community, many of whom wanted to end the confrontation as soon as possible so their children could go back to school. To make matters even worse, some of the supporters of community control also made anti-Semitic statements – all of which were immediately seized upon by the AFT leadership to discredit the idea of community control – even as radicals like Gold strongly backed the Arabs against the Israelis in the wake of the 1967 war.

## **SDS IMPLODES**

By October 1968, Columbia SDS was deeply and hopelessly split over the teachers strike. One wing was marching in protest side by side with advocates of community control even as the SDS Labor Committee at Columbia openly issued statements under the same SDS imprimatur that backed the teachers while arguing that virtually anyone who thought that there might be some merit in community control was either a conscious member of a ruling class plot, a paid Black Uncle Tom “poverty pimp” or a simple-minded dupe of the plotters.

But what was Columbia SDS?

In fact, no one could fully answer that question.

In the fall of 1968, Columbia SDS decentralized itself into different groups like the “Labor Committee” or the “Expansion Committee” (meant to fight Columbia expansion into Harlem). A report in the 25 November 1968 *New York Times* stated that in October Columbia SDS “decentralized into seven relatively autonomous committees or ‘raps’ or research-action projects. No one was elected to succeed Mark Rudd, now suspended from Columbia, as SDS chairman.”

As the crisis in New York City intensified over the teachers strike, the crisis at Columbia grew deeper as well. Clearly something had to give and it was the Labor Committee RAP that wound up being “disbanded” from Columbia SDS in a decision that seems to have taken place sometime in late October. The 25 November 1968 *Times* article described what happened this way: “SDS has also had internal problems. A long simmering feud came to the surface recently when the organization disbanded its militant Labor Committee, many of whose members belong to the Progressive Labor Party, often described as ‘Maoist.’ The final break came over a Labor Committee resolution attacking the New York City school decentralization plan as an attempt to divert the energies of minority groups from crucial economic issues to the relatively unimportant area of education. [An absurd summary of the issues – HH.] Most members of SDS were incensed. Two hundred of them had recently marched more than five miles to the headquarters of the United Federation of Teachers on Park Avenue and 20th Street to demonstrate in support of the Ocean Hill-Brownsville experimental district in school decentralization.”

## THE RUDD REPORT

In a March 1969 article looking back at Columbia in the West Coast radical journal *The Movement* that reflected the anti-LC and anti-PL line, Mark Rudd writes: “because of the intensive and all-pervading racism in the United States, white radicals are sometimes unwilling to follow black leadership. This was the situation during the recent UFT boycott of the New York City schools over the issue of community control. Both Progressive Labor Party and their arch-enemy, the Labor Committee, manifested their racism by refusing to support community control on the grounds that it was a cooptive plan designed by the ruling class to split the working class (both racist teachers and black parents are ‘workers’ primarily, according to PLP). Neither grouplet saw the class nature

of a united black community fighting for better schools against the racist ruling-class school board and the racist teachers' union."

Rudd continues: "The implication of this blind spot on the part of PLP is that blacks are too stupid to figure out when community control turns into cooptation, and therefore, they should follow the dogmatic and unreal line of PLP: black parents and white teachers united to fight for better education (a position which ignores both the racism of white teachers and the fact that blacks already are fighting for better schools). SDS because of its internal factional warfare, lost numerous opportunities to support the black struggle and also to begin educating the white community about its own racism, both of which is absolutely necessary."

Later in the same article, Rudd tries to explain "why the movement waned this fall" and cites (among other reasons), "the baseless Liberation School . . . the rise of an elite leadership in SDS, the insane sectarian faction fighting forced on the chapter first by the Labor Committee sectarians, and then by Progressive Labor Party members who moved into Columbia (there was only one member over the summer)."

Along with Rudd, PL also tried to get the LaRouche-led NY SDS Labor Committee disbarred both from regional and national SDS because PL also said it considered the LC too "rightwing." In a September-October 1969 *Campaigner* editorial statement, the LC wrote that "the Labor Committee has been for over a year the principal focus of the worst organizational crimes committed by PL'ers." It goes on to state that "it was PL who introduced the phony charge of 'racism' to SDS polemics – against the Labor Committee. . . . Furthermore, it was PL which introduced the motion to 'expel' the Labor Committee – twice, in regional SDS, and at the December SDS conference [in Ann Arbor -- HH]."

## **RIDING THE EXPULSION MERRY GO ROUND**

In his April 1971 *New Solidarity* history of the early Labor Committee, Tony Papert reported that the New York LC has been "thrice" expelled from SDS by which he means the first dissolution of the Labor Committee RAP at Columbia, the second Regional SDS abolishment of the old SDS Regional Labor Committee and then the last "expulsion" at Ann Arbor, a conference that Papert almost certainly attended.

"The Labor Committee question" even appears in an article in the 29 December 1968 *New York Times* coverage of the SDS Ann Arbor national council meeting. The Times noted that "Another issue at the convention – dealing also with democracy within SDS – is an effort by the New York SDS to throw out the New York labor committee of the Students for Democratic Society for ideological reasons."

Although the *Times* doesn't report how the issue was resolved, Kirkpatrick Sale writes that the LC "was kicked out of the chapter [at Columbia – HH], a move reaffirmed by a regional meeting and the December National Council meeting. The Labor Committee continued to function, however, still calling itself part of SDS on the grounds that SDS

was a non-exclusionary organization and the expulsion therefore invalid.”

In her statement published in *New Left Notes* in November 1968 before the Ann Arbor meeting (and quoted in full in an earlier OMF post), Bernadine Dohrn – as SDS Inter-Organizational Secretary -- described the way National SDS had addressed the LC problem this way: “This fall the Labor Committee issued leaflets in the name of SDS supporting the teachers’ union in the NY schools crisis. Columbia SDS and the NY regional assembly had condemned the racist teachers’ strike and demanded that the Labor Committee not continue to produce pro-teachers’ union leaflets in the name of SDS, contrary to the position taken by the membership. When the leaflets continued, the Columbia chapter ‘expelled’ the Labor Committee – to publicly disclaim leaflets claiming to represent the position of SDS. Neither individual members nor the ideas of the Labor Committee were ousted from participation in SDS. The ‘expulsion’ was to discredit the Labor Committee as spokesman for SDS.”

In a paragraph headed “Labor Committee Still Using SDS Name,” Dohrn continued: “Later, a NY regional assembly dissolved the NY SDS regional labor committee – which had become the organization called the Labor Committee – and set up a new regional committee on labor. As can be seen from the Labor Committee’s press release, they are still using the name SDS Labor Committee.”

My best guess, then, is that after the SDS regional labor committee was dissolved, the “new regional committee on labor” was controlled by PL which may have promoted the dissolution of the old regional labor committee for just this reason. Yet as we have seen in an earlier Old Mole File, the LC continued to lead its rump SDS Regional Labor Committee that included representatives of the Spartacist League and Workers League into 1969.

The Labor Committee, of course, claimed that since SDS was a “non-exclusionary” organization. Yet surely SDS could dissociate itself from policies the organization as a whole felt were wrong. But could SDS do this in a regional meeting, a national interim council meeting or only at a national convention?

If all this wasn’t confusing enough, it wasn’t even clear just exactly who was a member of SDS. In a long analysis of SDS and published in the 15 June 1969 issue of the *New York Times*, Thomas Brooks noted: “Membership in SDS is ill-defined, vague, a do-your-own-thing affair. Five dollars a year entitles a student to be a ‘national’ member and to receive a subscription to *New Left Notes*. Not everyone who belongs to a chapter, however, becomes a national member. As one SDS chapter member told me, ‘We don’t push national membership very much.’ Chapter memberships sometimes swing wildly, rising and falling with attendance at SDS-called meetings.”

Yet in spite of all these maneuvers, national SDS still was in the absurd position that the regional SDS branch in Philadelphia was controlled by Labor Committee supporters. From Kirkpatrick Sale’s book *SDS*: “Regional organizations, too, were held on a fairly tight rein [by the NO in Chicago – HH], with Regional Office staffers and the several

dozen travelers chosen from people who generally shared the NO politics and who generally attended the more or less monthly NIC meetings where RYM strategy was hammered out. ROs with clashing politics – for example the office in Philadelphia run by SDSers who styled themselves the ‘Labor Committee’ – were thrown off the roster and deliberately ostracized; while those sharing the RYM perspective – for example, the groups in New York, Michigan, Ohio, Washington, and Chicago – were allowed a considerable degree of autonomy and given whatever largesse in terms of money, speakers, and literature the NO could afford.”

As a result of SDS factionalism, in April 1969 when the Philadelphia Labor Committee was hit by the fake “bomb plot” charges, national SDS did nothing to publicly support one of the strongest anti-terrorist factions inside the organization from an obvious police frame-up meant to discredit SDS as a whole!

## MEET THE CRAZIES

Did being in “national SDS” also mean that you endorsed terrorist actions by local SDS chapters as well? The idea of terrorist action as a form of “organizing” was known to virtually every serious member of SDS who had seen the film *The Battle of Algiers*. Meanwhile in parts of Latin America, there were attempts to organize terrorist groups inside major urban centers. In America, black radical groups like RAM pursued the same semi-clandestine path.

Once again, the question of the role of violence and general endorsement of criminality would prove highly disruptive inside SDS. Again from Brooks’ article: “SDS chapters vary widely in character – from the highly factionalized chapters at Columbia, Harvard, the colleges of the City University of New York, the University of Chicago and several of the California colleges and universities to non-factional chapters at such colleges as Stanford and Northwestern.

“There are also such SDS splinters as the Crazies, who recently broke up a Norman Mailer mayoralty campaign rally in New York, and the Lower East Side’s Up Against the Wall Mother\*\*\*\*ers. Both of these see themselves as wandering troubadours, clowns, poets and pioneers of the revolution – as part of the ‘international werewolf conspiracy’ – but tied as they are to the drug culture, their chief link to the organized New Left appears to be constant police harassment. There is, I am told, a ‘lot of overlap’ in membership between the Crazies and the Mothers. As to the Crazies’ exact relationship to SDS, it is perhaps best put by a New York SDSer who told me: ‘It’s hard to say. I don’t think they pay dues, but they do come around.’ The Mothers actually are a chapter, while the Crazies are an irruption. Both, it seems to me, share a cult of violence, valuing disruption for disruption’s sake, even within SDS meetings, and accent a destructive strain now evident on the hippie-cum-acid head sector of the New Left.”

The “Crazies” and “Mothers” both played an integral role in the SDS sub-culture most associated with Rudd and John Jacobs in New York and their “Jesse James Gang” counterparts in the mid-West. All these groups advocated the use of increasingly violent

confrontational tactics in their attempt to build a separate “revolutionary youth movement” (RYM).

Nor did the fact that smashing library windows might turn off college freshmen bother someone like JJ. If anything, he welcomed it.

People like JJ argued against praxis’s “new working class” line that the vast majority of white college students would never become real revolutionaries in the first place as they were themselves hopelessly compromised by their own “white skin privilege” and high income. The actual driving force for the world revolution would have emerge from an alliance between white working-class “greasers” and counter-culture drug outlaws of “AmeriKKKa” with groovy inner city blacks to collapse the entire American system so that Third World revolutionaries could win victories in their fight against Yankee imperialism. And the best way to collapse the system was to initiate spectacular acts of domestic terrorism “in the belly of the beast.”

Using these arguments JJ became the main author of the RYM I/Weatherman manifesto, a document that shocked even some of the most hardened opponents of PL inside SDS who formed RYM II in protest against both the Weatherman and PL.

From Wallerstein and Starr: “The rationale for the creation of a youth movement as opposed to a student movement manifested itself as early as the 1968 Columbia strike in a leaflet by one of the few members of SDS who at that time publicly called himself a communist, John Jacobs (known as JJ). What caught attention at the time the leaflet was written was JJ’s open advocacy of terrorist tactics to shut down Columbia.

“Particularly relevant here, however, is JJ’s analysis of the ‘coming American revolution.’ ‘Even though revolution is in the interests of the majority of the people within the American economic empire, nevertheless, within the territorial U.S. the majority of people are materially a privileged group. Still, the need of the system to regiment and pervert people’s lives is so great, that many youths will revolt against being the well-fed-but-spiritually-castrated cogs in the oppression machine.’ That succinctly summarized the logic of forming a revolutionary organization whose focus would not be the American working class, but youth.”

Had SDS now reached such an absurd level that Up Against the Wall Mother\*\*\*\*ers could be a legitimate SDS chapter in good standing with the National Office but the SDS Regional Labor Committee had to be dissolved because it supported the New York City teachers union?

The clear answer was “Yes.”

## **PL FUMBLES THE STRIKE**

As for PL, its response to the extremely critical – and extremely difficult -- issue of the teachers strike seems almost to be schizophrenic. PL even invented a conspiracy



theory of sorts attacking Albert Shanker and the UFT by claiming that somehow Shanker was in a conspiracy with the Lindsay Administration to wreck black parents and white teachers!

In November 1968, *Challenge* ran an article headlined “Shanker Helps Lindsay Use Racism to Bust Union, Confuse Parents.” The article reprinted the “text of a mass-distributed leaflet on School Shutdown.” The leaflet claimed that “Shanker’s phony ‘strike for job security’” really was directed “against the interests of both the parents and the teachers, splitting and weakening them instead of their common enemy – Lindsay and the Board of Education.”

The statement went on to argue: “For the past twenty years, the NYC school system has been deteriorating. It has now hit rock bottom. This happened because the City, State, and Federal government have followed a vigorous anti-communist policy at home and abroad. . . . Lindsay wants the educational program in NYC geared to keep the Black and Puerto Rican youth at sub-standard levels . . . . Shanker has never fought these key evils. Thousands of parents in the city, especially Black and Puerto Rican, have wised up. They have begun to see the real enemy, the ruling class Board of Ed. and Lindsay. They are boiling mad. They want real change.”

But according to PL, real change couldn’t come through decentralization: “Local boards, whether a hundred or a dozen, whether they be made up of all honest parents or the mixed bag of parents and Lindsay agents now proposed or in existence, can’t solve the school crisis. THEY CAN’T ADD A DIME to the school budget.”

(The LC made almost the exact same point in its propaganda as well.)

PL later continues: “Thus the basis for a much-strengthened UFT exists in an alliance of working-class parents and teachers against the Board. Then the teachers would strike for increased funds – for higher salaries, new and better schools, smaller classes, etc. – and they would have the complete support of the parents.” But Shanker “is directing all the wrath he can muster against the working-class Black and Puerto Rican parents of Ocean-Hill-Brownsville.” Therefore PL claims in an all cap sentence: “WE SAY THAT THIS IS A RACIST, UNION-BUSTING ACTIVITY BY THE SHANKER LEADERSHIP AND THAT THE ONLY WAY TO BUILD THE UNION’S STRENGTH IS TO ALLY WITH THE WORKING-CLASS PARENTS.”

In the very next paragraph under the headline “‘COMMUNITY CONTROL’ A FRAUD,” PL argued: “To prevent this strategy from developing a parent-teacher alliance, Lindsay and the Board created a buffer between themselves and the parents and teachers. Local community ‘control’ boards are a cover-up to deflect the anger of the parents and teachers. . . . So, instead of parents and teachers fighting Lindsay and the (big) Board, they are cleverly pitted against one another.”

PL here seems to be trying to distance itself from the anti-PL Ted Gold. On 14 October 1968, Gold’s pro-community control faction in Columbia SDS took part in a protest rally

outside the board of education that demanded that Rhody McCoy – who was at the demo -- be reinstated as administrator of the Ocean Hill-Brownsville district. The pro-McCoy crowd of some 5,000 -- reports an article in the 15 October 1968 *New York Times* -- was “predominantly white and predominantly young.” It was also “about a third of the numbers” who had marched in support for the UFT, which also enjoyed the support of virtually every other trade union in New York City.

Trapped between the pro-UFT LC on the one hand and Ted Gold’s SDS on the other, PL gamely stuck with its own convoluted conspiracy theory about the allegedly KKK-like Albert Shanker: “Shanker is deliberately playing this game [of the ruling class – HH]. On the one hand he calls on Lindsay to enforce the ‘law’ in the ghetto. This means calling out the cops and National Guard. . . . On the other hand, Shanker sets Lindsay up as the great ‘impartial’ who will eventually be able to unravel this sticky matter. Instead of Lindsay and the Board being exposed as the mis-educators, Shanker puts the rank-and-file teachers into this category. This kind of ‘leadership’ should be reserved for the KKK. So, the suspended teachers in Ocean Hill-Brownsville are merely pawns in the Shanker-Lindsay plan to screw the parents and teachers.”

Yet even PL couldn’t bring itself to publicly advocate teachers crossing the AFT picket line as Gold did. Instead, PL concluded its statement: “During Shanker’s provocation, many have sought out teachers on picket lines and disused these issues with them. . . . Only a few are picketing.”

### **AUSTIN SHOW DOWN**

Yet if PL hoped to marginalize the LC on the one hand while also protecting itself against charges of “racism,” the plan badly failed.

By the spring of 1969, the same victorious SDS faction that had declared the Labor Committee evil now turned its fury even more on PL in the rapidly escalating struggle for control over SDS. In the spring of 1969 the now too pro-PL “Expansion Committee” RAP would even be disbanded at Columbia using a precedent set by the Labor Committee precedent just a few months earlier.

From the Brooks’ article: “Credential fights take place at SDS conferences (quarterly) and conventions (annual) with increasing regularity. Last fall, the Columbia SDS chapter expelled its own labor committee for supporting the United Federation of Teachers in the school-decentralization dispute. And this spring, the Columbia SDS ordered that its expansion committee, sympathetic to the Progressive Labor Party, be disbanded. True, these decisions do not seem to have meant much --- both dissident groups still function at Columbia. But their members have been threatened, verbally, with bodily harm, a new development on the ‘loving’ New Left.”

At the late March 1969 SDS National Council meeting in Austin, Texas, fights broke out on the convention floor. PL now decided to actively oppose Black Nationalism as being essentially reactionary, throwing both the NO and Rudd groups into paroxysms of rage.

Again from the Brooks: “Their factional fight [between PL and the NO – HH] peaked at the SDS national conference in Austin, Texas, last March. Progressive Labor pushed its Worker-Student Alliance line, ridiculed ‘student power’ and criticized Black Power as black bourgeois nationalism, which like all nationalism is fundamentally opposed to proletarian internationalism. The National Office faction called for an all-out fight against ‘white skin privileges’ and generally held, on the race question, that the blacks were . . . an oppressed colony within the mother country.”

After PL’s Jeff Gordon asked why German Jews weren’t then considered a colony as well, a National Office advocate shot back: “How dare you tell me that the Jews in Germany are the same as blacks in America. The \*\*\*\*ing Jews in Germany had money.” (A PL resolution denouncing drug use as counter-revolutionary also threw the Austin conclave into angry turmoil as the majority of the delegates proudly voted to “just say yes.”)

As for the “acid rock” faction inside the New Left, Brooks writes in his profile of SDS: “The Up Against the Wall types want to turn The Movement on. But, much more alarmingly, the Mothers have raised the slogan: ‘The Future of Our Struggle is the Future of Crime in the Streets.’ Their statement in New Left Notes last fall went on: ‘Being outside is the characteristic of all those opposing America now, and being outside creates the needs that will motivate our struggle until it has destroyed all that we are outside of . . . *A New Manifesto: There Are No Limits to Our Lawlessness.*’” Brooks then adds: “Some skepticism still exists within SDS toward this sort of mindlessness. Specifically refuting the Mothers, Fred Gordon . . . asks: ‘What will the traditional working class (and other social groups) think of a new lumpen class that lives off other people and celebrates violence in the streets as a potential program?’”

### “MARK CRUDD” PAYS A VISIT

In New York, the Rudd/JJ faction now tried to physically break up an LC meeting. In March 1969, the LC helped establish “People for Tomorrow,” a coalition of groups aimed at preventing the building of the State Office Building at 125th Street in Harlem. The LC had previously taken their proposal to a 1 March SDS Regional Conference but “the conference refused to consider the proposal because of the SDS Labor Committee’s defense of the United Federation of Teachers during the government provoked teachers’ strike last fall.” At the conference, “the baiting of the Labor Committee” was led by “now-totally-inactive Mark Rudd (his only function seems baiting the Labor Committee at Regional and National conferences).”

However Rudd (dubbed “Mark Crud” by the LC ) got a lot less inactive just a few days later according to a Labor Committee press release reprinted in the April 1969 issue of *The Campaigner*. It read: “**PRESS RELEASE:** Goons Disrupt Meeting to Oppose State Office Building. N.Y. SDS Labor Committee. March 11, 1969.”

Rudd’s attempt to break up the LC-organized meeting may have been a signal that the RYM/NO faction was now no longer going to react passively as the LC continued to

hold meetings under the name “NY SDS Labor Committee” in complete rejection of at least three separate SDS “cease and desist” orders as well as the 1 March 1969 SDS Regional Conference refusal to have anything to do with the Labor Committee. Seen from that point of view, one could argue that in a way Rudd was really acting to preserve the political integrity of the SDS “brand name” against the likes of the New York Labor Committee that had deliberately usurped the name for its own deceptive political agenda.

Be that as it may, the rest of the press release reads as follows: “Mark Rudd tonight led about twenty goons collected from around the NY Regional SDS office in an unsuccessful effort to physically disrupt a Columbia campus meeting convened to organize around demands for a high school and housing in Harlem. The meeting was held by the NY SDS Labor Committee, which has been conducting a petition and organizing campaign among high school and college students and trade unionists. This campaign has demanded: 1. That [then Governor] Rockefeller stop the State Office Building and that he build a new high school and low-rent housing on the site at 125th St. and 7th Ave. 2. That Lindsay build 23 new high schools. 3. A college education or a job with \$100 a week minimum wage for every high school student. 4 That the money for this come from taxing landlords and banks, not working people.

“Rudd’s goon squad assembled in the corridor during the first address of the meeting. Then they marched-in in a body, lining themselves against two walls of the meeting room, heckling and working themselves up to the point of physical assaults on members of the audience.

“After the audience expelled Rudd and his squad, the 75-person meeting continued with its addresses, discussion and work session.

“Acting on a motion presented by a George Washington High student, the meeting constituted an organization with the name ‘People for Tomorrow.’”

## **PHILLY FANATICS?**

Even as Rudd attacked the LC in New York, that same March, Richardson Dilworth, President of the Philadelphia Board of Education, claimed that SDS was planning to infiltrate the high schools and blow up several of them. As the head of Philadelphia SDS, Steve Fraser went on radio and TV to refute these charges. Here I will quote from Frank Donner’s book *Protectors of Privilege* on the Philadelphia “bomb plot” case but before doing so, I should point out that Donner’s use of the term “NCLC” is factually inaccurate for the March/April 1969 events as the organization was known as the “Philadelphia SDS Labor Committee.” (The adoption of the term “National Caucus of Labor Committees” only followed the collapse of SDS in the summer of 1969.)

From *Protectors of Privilege*: “In March [Philadelphia Police Commissioner Frank] Rizzo charged that the NCLC organizers were subverting the high schools and plotting to blow them up. He ‘documented’ his charge with *Your Manual*, a pamphlet on how to make

bombs and Molotov cocktails, which he reproduced in quantity for the local media and circulated with a memorandum stating: 'The Students for a Democratic Society is the moving force behind the circulation of this booklet in Philadelphia.' In fact, the pamphlet was published in San Francisco and referred to the local San Francisco scene only and was obviously not intended for use outside of that city. It had been seized and distributed by the Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) to urban police chiefs: the real 'moving force behind the circulation of this booklet in Philadelphia' was Rizzo himself. In a letter to the Philadelphia ACLU dated 11 April 1969, he justified his action by saying that he knew the pamphlet had been distributed at an NCLC meeting in Philadelphia as recommended reading and he believed that 'it is in the interest of the people of this city for them to be aware of the actions advocated by groups within our society.' Rizzo refused to disclose the source of his knowledge of SDS's use of the pamphlet."

Donner then comments: "The attempt to attribute this how-to-do-it manual to the NCLC was marked by a particularly offensive irony. Rizzo had in the past confined himself to targets whose style and rhetoric might create an expectation of violence. But the NCLC had fought factions in the student movement and the SDS that were committed to anarchist-terrorist methods: it favored coalition politics, mass pressure, and ameliorating legislative programs. In short, the political police of Philadelphia attributed a revolutionary bomb plot to a group that had come into being and defined itself by rejection of bomb plots as a political instrument."

After the first series of charges about the LC distributing a booklet about how to make bombs fell flat, on the night of 9 April 1969 some 10 officers from the Philadelphia Civil Disobedience Squad (Philadelphia's "Red Squad") raided Fraser's flat and supposedly "discovered" in Fraser's kitchen "an eight-ounce can of Dupont Rifle Powder, three six-inch by three-quarter inch outside-diameter pipes, each equipped with a hole bored in the center of the pipe, six metal pipe caps, a ten-ounce container labeled 'Olde English Tavenders Fruit Flavored Drops,' which contained a plastic explosive known as C-4 and about a six-inch length of red-orange dynamite fuse."

Here the saga of the LC's adventures in SDS reached a new level of absurdity: In New York Rudd's proto-Weatherman attacked the LC for being horrible racists, even as the NY LC-sponsored meeting that Rudd tried to disrupt called for the building of some 23 new high schools in New York for ghetto children. Meanwhile in Philadelphia that very same month the head of the city's Board of Education publicly claimed that the LC-dominated SDS chapter there was planning to blow up his city's high schools!

## **CONCLUSION – WHATEVER HAPPENED TO PAUL ROCKWELL?**

The author Roger Kahn quotes a Tony Papert speech from the Columbia strike days where Papert stated: "The concentration camps finished Christianity. Now we have to turn to Marx and Lenin." But what really wound up finished in this case was Anthony Papert's SDS.

Although the LC was a very small group in the vast ocean of SDS chaos, it still played a

remarkable role simply because its New York chapter emerged out the cauldron that was Columbia. I don't think it is possible to fully understand the emergence of RYM I/Weatherman without tracing the emergence of its East Coast leadership at least in part back to the heated arguments that began that summer at the Columbia Liberation School between people like Rudd, JJ, Ted Gold, Papert and "L. Marcus."

But if we have here focused on the great New Left carnivorous dinosaurs of the day like RYM I and PL – dinosaurs who didn't realize that in a year or two they would themselves face extinction – we have said far too little about the vast majority of SDS supporters who were self-defined independents and who belonged to no organized faction. This mostly "silent majority" did find its own spokesmen in people like Paul Rockwell.

So what ever happened to Paul Rockwell?

Did Rockwell, as LaRouche claimed, fall victim to peer pressure? Had the one thousand-and-one time Rockwell heard the claim that the Labor Committee was "racist" for supporting the KKK-like Albert Shanker finally persuaded him to abandon his close ties to Tony Papert and company? Of course, such an explanation is quite possible.

But I suspect that it is equally likely that an independent and well-informed leftist like Rockwell, the LC actually did "move right" during the New York City crisis that fall.

In short was there some validity to the attacks of both PL and "Mark Crud" in spite of themselves?

Recall that LaRouche wrote about Rockwell: "This person's obvious character defect was his eagerness to get to be the biggest celebrity possible in the shortest time. Our constant problem with him during the late Spring and Summer months was that each week, at least, he would propose some elaborate scheme for taking over part of some newspaper, or getting large amounts of money for a big circulation newspaper of our own -- every week, he was going to make us all suddenly politically rich."

But was this paragraph less a description of Paul Rockwell than of Lyndon LaRouche?

In order to offer a possible answer to this question, we must take one last look at the New York City teachers strike in our next New Mole File.

## **APPENDIX**

### **TED GOLD: "WEATHERFRIED"**

On 6 March 1970, the LC's old enemy Ted Gold died in an explosion at a Weatherman bomb making factory located in a townhouse on 18 West 11th Street in the West Village. In the debris after the blast, police found 57 sticks of dynamite and four pipe bombs. Gold and his friends were finishing off building nail bombs packed with dynamite when the explosion happened. The nail bombs were reportedly being prepared to go off

at a dance that night at Fort Dix which would be attended by non-commissioned army officers and their dates. Other bombs were reportedly being built to destroy the main library at Columbia and to hit local police stations, all in a mad attempt to supposedly “help the heroic Vietnamese people” by “bringing the war back home” in Weatherman rhetoric.

The driving force behind the bomb factory was John Jacobs (JJ), yet another bitter enemy of the Labor Committee. After the blast, JJ urged the Weatherman central committee at an emergency meeting not to back away from such attacks but in fact to escalate them. His arguments were also endorsed by Mark Rudd. Bernadine Dohrn, however, expelled JJ from the Weatherman while Mark Rudd found himself more or less exiled to Arizona. The Dohrn/Ayers/Jones top leadership clique “retooled” the organization and said it would only carry out “symbolic” bombings that would not harm any individuals. (True to their word, the Weathermen would even phone in warnings about planned blasts a few minutes ahead of time.)

Ted Gold’s involvement in the bomb factory came after he had been subjected to a cult-like environment designed to produce potential killers. It included a Weatherman version of “Beyond Psychoanalysis.”

From Jeremy Varon’s book *Bringing the War Home*: “Finally, Weatherman used ‘criticism-self-criticism’ sessions to keep members unflinchingly wed to the ‘correct line.’

“By all accounts, the ‘criticism-self-criticism’ sessions – also called ‘CSC’ or ‘Weatherfries’ – were the most harrowing aspect of life in the collectives. Loosely derived from techniques used by Maoist revolutionaries in China, CSC ostensibly sought to encourage political and emotional honesty and group bonding . . . More deeply, the Weathermen used the practice to confront and root out their racist, individualist, and chauvinist tendencies. In tone and substance, the sessions were part political trial, part hazing, part shock therapy, part exorcism, and, in a word used by more than one former member, part ‘brainwashing.’ At their most intense, collectives singled out individuals for ‘criticism’ and then berated them – five, seven, a dozen hours or more without a break – about their flaws. Thought they were designed to break down barriers among members, the effect of the sessions was to enhance suspicions and rivalries within the group and to suppress fears and doubts. . . . [Former Weatherman member] Raulet described CSC as a ‘vicious tool to disgrace people into accepting collective discipline.’ Dohrn wondered years later, ‘I don’t know if there’s a good Maoism somewhere, but the Maoism that we adopted was stupid and lethal.’”

Varon also reports that “In the collectives, conventional comforts – from conversation with old friends to afternoons devoted to idle pleasures – were forbidden as well. Entranced by the Leninist notion of ‘democratic centralism,’ Weatherman exalted their leaders, granting them immense power to control – and, as former ‘cadre’ members would later charge – to manipulate those below them. In some collectives, nearly all personal decisions in the collectives, as basic as where one went at any given time, were subject to the approval of the leadership.”

The communes also trained Weathermen to brutally attack members of rival groups like PL. In Ellen Frankfort's book *Kathy Boudin and the Dance of Death*, she reports that the Black Panthers David Hilliard publicly threatened the Weatherman with violence after the Weathermen attacked "a PL caucus and beaten members, some badly enough to require hospitalization."

The extent of Weatherman violence and criminality led PL to charge the Weatherman with being supported by the cops.

(As an aside it should be noted that many members of SDS thought that PL's attempt to take over SDS by Leninist tactics smacked of some kind of covert manipulation attempt by some sinister force. Carl Oglesby even joked that maybe "PL" should be pronounced "Police" given just how deeply divisive PL proved to be inside the larger organization.)

From a SDS (WSA) statement from October 1969: "On Wednesday, October 1, a group of provocateurs claiming to be from SDS attacked students and teachers at Boston English High School. . . . These actions were all the work of a group of police agents and hate-the-people lunatics who walked out of SDS at the June convention . . . . The bankers and big businessmen who run this country are using this clique (led by Mark Rudd) for two purposes. First, to divert people so that they won't fight back anymore. Second, to discredit SDS and radical ideas in general. This group's 'Days of Rage' planned in Chicago, Oct. 8-11, is a police trap – no one should go to it."

PL also issued a crudely produced pamphlet entitled "*Who are the Bombers? Often the Rulers!*" In it, PL wrote about the RYM I /Weatherman: "Their attacks on the people are something the Green Berets would think up, something they would hire Vietnamese finks to do, disguised as Vietnamese revolutionaries to turn off the people. . . . These actions are so clearly geared to isolating radicals from the people that it's clear cops are influential among RYM leaders."

The PL pamphlet also reprinted a 22 June 1970 *Time* magazine story about "Tommy the Traveler." A classic police agent provocateur, Tommy actually traveled from campus to campus in upstate New York trying to trap students into carrying out bomb plots for which they would then get arrested.

Although PL offered zero proof that the top Weatherman leadership was filled with police agents, the group's statements and proposed actions seemed a police agent's dream. Yet as far as it is known, the FBI's attempts to infiltrate the Weatherman were made to shut the organization down by capturing its top leaders and preventing future bombings and not to encourage their lunacy.

Still the entire RYM I "line" seemed tailor made to openly invite police infiltration as well as provide the ideological cover for spectacular acts of terrorism that would only be used to discredit the broad anti-war left. And how would driving the United States even further to the right aid the NLF exactly?



Although the Weathermen have enjoyed a weird kind of prestige thanks to the Walter Mitty fantasists inside a now rapidly aging contingent of both the left-liberal press and academia, the simple fact is that if the New York Weathermen (known as “the Fork” in homage to the Manson family) ever did manage to pull off their nail bomb attack on a Fort Dix dance, the nation would have been even further driven to the right.

Not only did Ted Gold know this, he actually wanted it to happen. At the Weatherman “war council” in Flint, Michigan, in late December 1969, author Ellen Frankfort notes that Weatherman leader Bernadine Dohrn openly praised the Manson family for killing “pigs” like Sharon Tate and sticking forks inside the bodies; Bill Ayers opined, “Bring the revolution home, kill your parents, that’s where it’s really at”; and Ted Gold stated: “Well if it will take fascism, then we’ll have to have fascism.”

As we have seen, after the townhouse disaster the top Weatherman leadership clique finally pulled back from the brink. In that sense, it could be argued that Ted Gold’s single greatest contribution to the revolution was getting blown up that cold day in early March.

**RESEARCH NOTES:** Documents such as “The Columbia Statement” and the various Rudd pieces as well as the PL and LC leaflets can be found in Immanuel Wallerstein and Paul Starr (ed.), *The University Crisis Reader* (New York, Random House, 1971), a two-volume work. A slightly rewritten version of “The Columbia Statement” can be found in a Paul Rockwell essay, “How We Became Revolutionaries,” in Tariq Ali (ed.), *The New Revolutionaries: A Handbook of the International Radical Left* (New York: William Morrow, 1969).

Although I have not dwelt at length on the ins and outs of the strike given that Papert and Steve Komm wrote about it in a April 1971 *New Solidarity* series, there are good accounts of Columbia that go into both Komm and Papert’s role in the strike. Two examples are Roger Kahn’s *The Battle for Morningside Heights* and Robert Friedman’s (ed.) *A History of the Columbia Crisis*.

Finally, Wallerstein and Starr briefly give some sense of the LC’s role in the Columbia strike: “The views of the Labor Committee are an interesting footnote to the strike. It was one of their leaders [Steve Komm – HH] who, on the night of April 22, the eve of the uprising, presented the program for the next day’s offensive; it was another of its leaders [Tony Papert – HH] who made the decision on April 24 to stay in Low Library, Columbia’s administration building, when most others in SDS, including Rudd, temporarily fled.”

---

*Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 07-19-2009 at 03:24 PM.*

**STRIKE! (Part two) “LYNDON SHACHTMAN”? – The NMF don’t play by Moscow Rules!**

---

This last New Mole File that will be devoted to the very early Labor Committee grouping in New York and its role in teachers strike offers a possible explanation as to “whatever happened to Paul Rockwell.” But before returning to the stormy events of the fall of 1968, we must first take a more circuitous route and begin our narrative some seven years later in 1975 and on the pages of the *Daily World*.

It should come as no surprise that after the NCLC’s attacks on the American Communist Party in the spring of 1973, the CPUSA would argue that the NCLC must be some kind of conspiratorial organization backed by “dark forces” linked to the U.S. government. What is surprising is that the CP paper *The Daily World* peddled the same line since at least 1971 if not earlier. Yet when one tries to discover exactly where this belief first originated, the trail inevitably leads back to New York LC’s decision to support the New York teachers union. In a special *Daily World* supplement from September 1975 entitled “Phony ‘Labor’ Party Exposed as CIA Front,” for example, one article states: “Racist views of the NCLC were expressed from its earliest beginnings. As one of its first campaigns, the group supported the campaign of Albert Shanker, head of the United Federation of Teachers, against community control of schools in the black community.”

To get an idea of the jaw-dropping stupidity of the CP’s charges – a stupidity only surpassed by the NCLC – it is worth quoting from another article from the same packet, an angry reaction to a *Wall Street Journal* story about the NCLC/USLP as a new kind of communist grouping. The CP was particularly apoplectic because the author of the article, James Hyatt, reported rumors that the NCLC may have been getting indirect Soviet funding. From the *Daily World*: “The WSJ, which prides itself on accuracy, also changed the date of the NCLC’s founding. That is significant, because last December 30, the *New York Times* reported that CIA officials told Watergate investigators that Nixon’s ‘dirty tricks’ operation had penetrated the Students for a Democratic Society group at Columbia University in 1968, soon after the Columbia strike. Everyone in the left could tell the WSJ that this was when and where the NCLC was formed. Despite this, the WSJ claims the NCLC was formed a year earlier in an effort to obscure the obvious connections between the NCLC and the CIA.”

First and most obvious, the Nixon “dirty tricks” operation didn’t even exist in 1968 since Nixon was only elected president in November 1968 and didn’t take the oath of office until January 1969. Second, the FBI’s COINTELPRO operations did begin in the wake of Columbia. Needless to say, the FBI had for decades placed informants inside the Left. (FBI informants, for example, were at FUNY in 1966-67.) Yet the idea of an active COINTELPRO disruption campaign against the New Left per se didn’t get off the ground until after Columbia. The FBI’s William Sullivan even wrote in his memoirs: “After the Columbia riot the New Left was fair game.”

Yet as we have seen, without crucial leadership from LC members like Steve Komm and Tony Papert – who famously held Low Library after Mark Rudd fled – Columbia might not have even happened in the way that it did. And while it is true that the group did adopt the name “N.Y. SDS Labor Committee” in the wake of Columbia, as the WSJ

accurately reported, it had been a visible political tendency since at least 1967. (As we have seen, the first *Campaigner* even came out in February 1968, a few months before Columbia.)

### **GEORGE MORRIS EXPLAINS IT ALL**

This kind of fractured fairy tale history of the NCLC also appeared in a major article by *Daily World* "Labor Editor" and longtime CP leader George Morris that was published on 19 October 1971. Here Morris claims that the NCLC "are actually a handful of anarchist elements who broke away from the now defunct Students for a Democratic Society (SDS)." Besides being highly comical from a historical point of view, the charge that the NCLC consisted of a "handful of anarchist elements" comes right out of the old Stalinist playbook.

Morris later says that groups like then NCLC, the Workers League, and the Progressive Labor Party who claim to be ultra-revolutionary never attack "the most reactionary labor leaders like those in [George] Meany's circle." As for the "ringleaders" of such sects, they "are clearly getting encouragement from very reactionary sources – as employer agencies, police, FBI, CIA or any of the other instruments for disruption and division of the progressive sectors of the working class movement." Morris continues: "What else can you say of groups that make those who move forward their major target. What else can you say of a group like the 'Labor Committee' that seems to have ample funds to saturate every demonstration with printed leaflets? The clear object of the 'Labor Committee' is to disperse and confuse every manifestation of progress. . . . This is not a 'revolutionary' group: it is a counterrevolutionary conspiracy and should be known as such." (As to how one actually disperses and confuses a "manifestation," Morris remains mute.)

Yet what is truly interesting about the Morris column is what provoked its appearance in the first place, namely a rally where the Labor Committee attacked John Lindsay. Morris reports that there was "a labor rally for peace and against the wage freeze and racism held in the New York garment center" and addressed by "a considerable section of the New York labor movement" as well as Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer of the United Auto Workers, and Mayor John Lindsay. "It was, as the Mayor observed, an advanced step because it brought together a substantial labor group in action for peace, a refutation of the claim of the George Meanys that they speak for labor in support of the Indochina war. . . . When the Mayor was introduced, a score of these disrupters by obvious pre-arrangement appeared to heckle him."

Leaving aside the question of the metaphysical distinction between appearing to heckle someone as opposed to actively heckling someone, Morris continues, "The question was not whether there is ground for criticizing the Mayor on a number of issues. In this case, he came as a powerful voice for an end of the war and aligned himself with a peace movement that of necessity must be broad enough to include people like the Mayor. The group calls itself 'National Caucus of Labor Committees.'"

To appreciate Morris's article fully, it must also be understood that the appearance of Lindsay on a stage with a leading member of the UAW at a rally that also included David Livingston, the CP-friendly head of District 65 was not insignificant. For years the top leadership of the American labor movement had been deeply divided over the war in Vietnam. These same divisions were played out in the ranks of Norman Thomas's Second International-allied Socialist Party in America not to mention the leading Second International-allied party in the world – the German SPD which under German Chancellor and SPD leader Willy Brandt had entered into "Ostpolitik" with the Soviet Union.

### **MAX SCHACHTMAN AND THE "AFL-CIA"**

Born in 1903, George Morris lived through the fights with the "Right Opposition" Lovestone group starting in the late 1920s as well as the CPs fixation on the sinister evils of Trotskyism from the 1930s up until Stalin's demise. More important for our purposes, in 1967 Morris published a book entitled *CIA and American Labor; the Subversion of the AFL-CIO's Foreign Policy* based on public exposes of the CIA's involvement in both the labor movement and the Congress for Cultural Freedom (CCF). As fate would have it, one of the centers of the "AFL-CIA" (as it was dubbed) was the AFL-CIO's International Department run by Jay Lovestone.

In order to understand these developments and the significant they would have for the Labor Committee, it is necessary to spend the next few paragraphs trapped in the thicket of post-war American left history, a parallel universe marked by the painful march of ever changing abbreviations for tiny cadre groupings. Behind the dizzying names for the sects lay the fight between the "Second International" and the Soviet-run "Third International" and its successor organizations

By the mid-1950s some former Trotskyists – and here we will focus most on Max Schachtman's Workers Party/International Socialist League (ISL) -- entered the struggle on the side of the Second International and merged into Norman Thomas's Socialist Party while members of the ISL's youth group inspired by Michael Harrington joined the SP's Young Peoples Socialist League (YPSL). (Other "Left Shachtmanites" like Tim Wohlforth and James Robertson gravitated toward the SWP.)

The chief political organization for the Shachtmanite Trotskyists turned social democrats as we have seen was Norman Thomas's Socialist Party, whose political journal was *New America*. (Future ADL leader Irwin Suall – who was not a Shachtman supporter as far as I can tell although he encouraged the merger --served the National Secretary of the Socialist Party under Thomas.)

The SP, in turn, maintained close ties to the League for Industrial Democracy (LID). In 1960 LID's youth group, the Student League for Industrial Democracy (SLID), changed its name to Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). (In 1965 SDS broke its formal ties to the League over SDS's refusal to exclude anyone who openly identified as a Communist.) Meanwhile, Shachtman's followers continued to become more influential in

the labor movement. Albert Shanker even hired Shachtman's wife Yetta Barsh as his secretary at the UFT.

As for Shachtman, he was a beloved guru to his disciples as well as a first class ideologue schooled in the destructive attack dog methods of the old Left. A former close aide to Trotsky, Shachtman so hated Stalin's Soviet Union that his Workers Party actually opposed U.S. involvement on the side of the Soviet Union against Nazi Germany during World War II. The Workers Party argued that the entire affair was an "inter-imperialist war." Needless to say, such views were carefully noted by the likes of George Morris.

By the mid-1960s, the political crisis over the war in Vietnam further factionalized the SP, a process intensified by Norman Thomas's death in late 1968. The wing of the SP most identified with "leftwing Shachtmanite" Michael Harrington received support from more leftwing CIO unions operating in the Walter Ruther tradition. The more openly hawkish wing of the SP (supported by Shachtman personally) strenuously supported the war effort. By the early 1970s, the SP would spit into two sections with Michael Harrington heading up the Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee (DSOC) which later became the Democratic Socialists of America (DSA). The SP "right" became Social Democrats USA (SDUSA). In the 1970s SDUSA's leadership included Tom Kahn, Joan Suall, and Paul Feldman. (As for Joan Suall, she was Irwin Suall's sister-in-law and married to his brother Bertram Suall.)

SDUSA emerged in opposition to Michael Harrington's "New Politics" wing of the party in 1972 after Schachtman appealed to members of the Democratic Socialist Federation to join the SP. The DSF was a faction of the Social Democratic Federation – a group that has split from the SP in 1936 and known as the "Old Guard." In 1956 the Social Democratic Federation reunited with the SP but a splinter group known as the Democratic Socialist Federation– which included the SP's old Yiddish language federation – opposed the merger and became an independent organization. However in 1972, the DSF leadership followed Shachtman's advice and joined the SP to struggle against the "New Politics" wing. In so doing they gave birth to the SP-DSF which was soon renamed the SD-USA.

The SP-DSF grouping that became SDUSA refused to take a position in favor of McGovern during the 1972 elections. Some of them would later back Henry Jackson for President and become part of the "neo-con" supporters of Ronald Reagan. They used the AFL-CIO to promote the cause of Soviet Jewish "refusniks" as well as Alexander Solzhenitsyn. In the Reagan Administration a leading SDUSA member named Carl Gershman would head the National Endowment for Democracy (NED) while another SDUSA member named Tom Kahn worked at Lane Kirkland's international labor advisor, a post he took over from the CIA-linked Irving Brown, himself one of Jay Lovestone's closest advisors. (Some SDUSA members, however, reject the designation "neo-con" because they said they disagreed with the "neo-con" distinction between "authoritarian" and "totalitarian" governments.)

SDUSA continued to publish the journal *New America* on a regular basis. It also maintained strong links to the League for Industrial Democracy, the organization that would sponsor Dennis King's *Nazis without Swastikas: The Lyndon LaRouche Cult and its War on American Labor*, published under LID sponsorship in 1982. (In the mid-1980s, King also served as editor in chief of *New America*.)

## BACK TO 1968

In 1968, then, the Socialist Party clearly had both a left and right wing that were already in the process of beginning to splinter. (The party also had a small pacifist section led by Dave McReynolds of the War Resisters League.) The "right wing" of the party included such key unions as Albert Shanker's UFT. To someone like George Morris, the LC must have been somehow backed by "sinister forces" by simply supporting the UFT at all. Yet the LC seemed to go out of its way to encourage such a belief and by so doing – I suspect – led more independent leftists like Paul Rockwell to break with LaRouche.

First things first: In a sense LaRouche literally was "funded" by the UFT since Carol was a member of the union and taught math in city high schools. LaRouche, in turn, mooched off her income. More seriously, the NY Labor Committee spent almost two years involved in agitation around the teachers strike and the related question of open admission. This campaign involved the production of LaRouche's *The Philosophy of Socialist Education* published as a pamphlet in 1969 as well as Carol's *The Disadvantaged Teacher* which appeared in 1970. However for our purposes, the most significant LC document was "*The New York School Crisis*" published in October 1968 as a pamphlet by "L. Marcus and Tony Papert."

October also marked the first attempts inside NYC SDS to delegitimize the LC. From the introduction to a December 1968 *Campaigner* reprint of an LC statement first written during the fight that fall in the Columbia SDS chapter and then the SDS regional meeting.

From the introduction: "During October, various New York City SDS organizations, especially the Columbia University chapter and the regional office, were subjected to continuous, intense outside pressure from certain government agencies and private foundation projects. These sources demanded that SDS take steps to either gag or disband the NY Regional SDS Labor Committee whose persistent leafleting and organizing had dealt a few small tactical defeats to Mayor Lindsay's strike-breaking organization in the New York City school crisis. SDS groups were threatened by the 'poverty' organizers: Unless you gag the Labor Committee, we'll denounce SDS as 'white racist' throughout the black community. 'Poverty' agents wasted three weeks and uncounted man hours attempting to provoke a split within the Labor Committee itself, scoring our loss of exactly one promising newer member."

(Almost certainly that member was Paul Rockwell.)

The LC statement continues: "This intervention by government agents into the internal

affairs of SDS produced the following results. The Columbia chapter made itself the laughingstock of the university by ‘disbanding’ an organization (the Labor Committee) over which it had no authority.” [In fact, it disbanded the Labor RAP project at Columbia. Since Columbia SDS had already decentralized itself into seven RAPs, it was not clear if one section could ban another particularly over ideological disputes – HH.]

The statement continued: “In an effort to save the ‘face’ of Columbia anarchists, a regional meeting was called by anarchists and Progressive Labor Party members in NY SDS, which ‘disbanded’ an organization over which they also had absolutely no control. The regional group then proposed to create a counterfeit Labor Committee which would attempt to embarrass the real Labor Committee by circulating scurrilous anti-labor leaflets in its name! Less subtle SDS anarchists at the same meeting proposed that Labor Committee members be beaten and their offices broken into and wrecked.”

The October 1968 statement challenges the legality of expulsion this way: “The steering committee of the Columbia University chapter of Students for a Democratic Society asks for the disbandment of the NY Regional SDS Labor Committee. This amounts to the expulsion of its members if they continue to publicly express their views. The steering committee’s action comes because these members have continued to do so despite a previous, illegal gag ruling by the Columbia chapter.

“This proposal, which in effect demands SDS consensus on the school issue, constitutes an effort by one group (within the Columbia chapter) to censor the activities of another, independent SDS organization. The original gag motion and present expulsion proposal are, moreover, absolute violations of the ‘non-exclusionary’ provisions of the national SDS constitution and of the actual practices of SDS since its founding. The most recent national conference of SDS [East Lansing, Michigan] voted down a proposal by the same political tendency attacking the Labor Committee today, to violate the ‘non-exclusionary’ rule by expelling Progressive Labor Party members.

“Some opponents of the Labor Committee at Columbia have already referred to the questionable legality of such attempts to silence it. Since the last national conference voted down the Jared Israel [PLP] proposal (to strengthen the organizational powers of the regional offices), neither the Columbia steering committee nor the NY regional office have any power to curb the political activities of the SDS Labor Committee. Unless the Labor Committee should elect to resign from SDS under present pressures (which it has no intention of doing), it will continue to publicize its views as an SDS organization up to the point that a national conference is convened to expel it. The Labor Committee is absolutely not going to take down its SDS label because of any number of the sort of resolutions being put forth by its political opponents.”

(The December 1968 *Campaigner* also footnotes an attempt by a member of Columbia SDS named Stu Gedal to get Columbia SDS to offer “critical support” of Ocean Hill-Brownsville, only to be denounced by Hilton Clark (Kenneth Clark’s son) as a white racist while SDSer Juan Gonzalez demanded that SDS support the Ocean Hill-Brownsville board “all the way.”)

In this context we now turn to the October 1968 *"The New York School Strike"* by LaRouche and Papert. What is most striking for our purposes here is not the extent to which LaRouche and Papert try to denigrate Kenneth Clark as a new "Uncle Tom" or their "CIA conspiracy" theory that the entire dispute had been designed as an insidious counter-insurgency plot by the ruling class but the highly sympathetic way Albert Shanker and the UFT leadership are critiqued.

From the pamphlet: "The UFT Shanker leadership fell flat on its face into the trap prepared for it by the Ford Foundation. It responded to the complex issue as if Ocean Hill-Brownsville governing board were an ordinary employer. . . . Shanker's fatal strategic mistake was his failure to undercut McCoy politically. Shanker did not consistently denounce McCoy as a tool for the Ford Foundation, and did not attempt to expose McCoy by proposing to discuss with the community separately, did not attempt to split community people away from McCoy. He did nothing to put the union in the position of an ally of black ghetto people. Worse, as the struggle intensified, he put the union in the position of being an ally of the central school board and later of Mayor Lindsay, demanding that they use police, etc. to repress the community, instead of limiting the demand to closing the affected schools. . . . By such mistakes, Shanker et al. strengthened the hand of Lindsay and the Ford Foundation puppet-masters . . . ."

Yet instead of the expected call for Shanker to change or resign, the pamphlet instead argues: "Shanker could not have acted other than he did. If, in one sense, he has made a grave strategic mistake, his nature did not permit him to act otherwise. The UFT has no serious record of struggles on behalf of the ghetto. It does not struggle seriously for adequate low-rent housing, for a city-wide \$100 weekly minimum wage, for urgently needed productive jobs for ghetto victims. . . . The pattern of the Shanker leadership has been to lobby in Albany, to wheel-and-deal at City Hall. . . . Shanker has mainly played the old craft-union game of maneuvering for a piece of the 'concession pie'. . . ."

In short, the LC had just accused Shanker of the same kind of "me first" syndicalist mentality that it had so lavishly attacked in every other context. So should Shanker be attacked from the Left? Strikingly, the LC line in October 1968 was "No."

"Let there be no hint of a devil-theory in this. Simply replacing Shanker is no answer at all. Shanker's backwardness and strategic errors reflect the backwardness of the union membership as a whole. Without changing the programmatic outlook and eliminating craft-union 'professional' narrowness among a majority of union members, a simple change at the top would be no real change at all. It is easy to pick up the cry of 'throw the bums out,' and to ignore the fact that 'bums' stay in elected office because they are supported or at least tolerated by a majority of the members. Shanker's errors are a reflection of the need to re-educate the union's rank and file."

Yet the LC did more than simply apologize for Shanker as a "craft trade unionist." If the LC wanted to, it could have pointed to Shanker's role as a "State Department Socialist." After all, the LC had no qualms about accusing Kenneth Clark and Rhody McCoy of



being "CIA"-type "Uncle Toms." So why not even mention the fact that Albert Shanker was a rightwing Social Democratic? And didn't rightwing Social Democrats also have links to the "AFL-CIA"?

### **TONY PAPERT AND CARL GERSHMAN?**

"LC Upholds Deal with Socialist Party" reads the title of a leaflet written by Dave Cunningham, a member of the NY Labor Committee and editor of *Spartacist*, the journal of James Robertson's Spartacist League. Cunningham reports that in a 16 February 1969 SDS LC meeting, he tried to raise the issue of a Tony Papert article that appeared in the Socialist Party USA journal *New America* on 22 January 1969.

Papert's article -- entitled "New Left's Bourgeois Impulses" -- appeared on page 7 of *New America*. The editors added a note which read in part: 'While *New America* does not agree with Papert's positive orientation to SDS, we believe his analysis is worthy of consideration. The second part [my emphasis] of Papert's article will appear in a future issue.'

I have looked at a microfilm version of *New America* from the period and I could not find a "part two." However I did find that on the opposite page from Papert's initial article was a long piece by Carl Gershman -- the future head of the NED -- entitled "'Community Control' Rally Turns into Sharp Debate" about a meeting held on 11 January 1969 sponsored by "the New Coalition," an opposition faction to Shanker inside the UFT.

If one looks at back issues of *New America*, you will find other articles by Gershman and other SP writers who followed the New Left SDS debates in considerable detail. Papert's discussion of the 26-31 December 1968 SDS NC (National Council) in Ann Arbor is in line with *New America's* focus on SDS.

Papert's article is a well informed report on the future of SDS although he does discuss the anti-LC vote at Ann Arbor, writing: "And its first official action had the form of a purge: a resolution supposedly 'disbanding' the N.Y. SDS Labor Committee, part of the third and smallest faction [after PL and what Papert calls "the anarchists"], on the grounds that it had supported last fall's UFT strike. That gesture was the only thing on which PL'ers and anarchists could unite." Papert later said that PL and the other leftist sects served as "volunteer strikebreakers and sheep herders" for "corporate liberal John Lindsay" during the strike.

The article also states that the CP -- via its allied "New MOBE" anti-war group -- was trying to move into SDS and more or less turn it into a support group for radicalized students who had entered the Left from the Eugene McCarthy campaign.

[Papert's argument was not uncommon at the time. From Kirkpatrick Sale's SDS in his chapter "fall 1968": "There was even considerable talk in the air about a merger of SDS with the left-wing Communists and the National Mobilization Committee to form an entirely new group which would outlaw PL from the start. Dohrn labeled this talk 'pure

and simple trash' in a *New Left Notes* article in December, but it certainly had wide currency in the organization and represented the thinking of at least some SDS veterans." (494-95)]

### **“ALBERT SHANKER ‘JOINS’ THE LABOR COMMITTEE”? OR VICE VERSA?**

If Papert's analysis of the future of SDS read like a sophisticated (if erroneous) portrait of the group written by a well-informed insider, the next question has to be: What was it doing in *New America*?

Dave Cunningham's failed attempt to repudiate Papert's *New America* essay followed a 13 February 1969 "Open Letter" also by Cunningham attacking Papert and the links to the SP. Cunningham said that he found out about the article's preparation more or less by accident. He and Papert were in the same car when the NYC group was driving to Canada.

Papert and Cunningham were almost certainly headed off to Montreal to attend the "Hemispheric Conference to End the War in Vietnam." (For more on this event, see and earlier OMF post 2284 which this post updates in part – HH.)

The Montreal conference took place from 28 November-1 December 1968. As we have seen in an earlier post, the teachers strike had only ended a few days before and there was no guarantee that trouble couldn't break out yet again.

If Cunningham found out about Papert's decision to write for *New America* in late November, it strongly suggests that the LC and the UFT/SP had been working together for some time before hand. Cunningham recalled that he was stunned by the news that Papert would write for such a journal although Papert dismissed the upcoming article nonchalantly as an attempt to gain free publicity in the bourgeois press.

Yet if Papert had an agreement to write an article for *New America* as far back as mid-to-late November it seems to have been delayed until after the Ann Arbor conclave. We do know, however, that an article did appear on the pages of *New Left Notes* – not *New America*-- written by the Labor Committee a few weeks later.

First we examine the LC statement of 16 December 1968 and reprinted in *New Left Notes*. It began: "The continuing factional dispute inside of Students for a Democratic Society has taken an incredible turn. The anarchist-National Office staff coalition plans to merge SDS with the most right wing parts of the movement, the National Mobilization Committee and the so-called left caucus of the Communist Party. The merged organization will have as its purpose the organization of 'youth-as-a-class.'

"The merger plans an SDS-Mobilization committee joint demonstration in Washington at Nixon's inauguration, another bloody and senseless confrontation with the police. Several members of the National Interim Council of SDS, including Jeff Jones of NYC, have been publicly backing this demonstration. This is to be followed by the formation of

a joint organization with Mobilization and the CP caucus, ostensibly to 'defend the movement' (the National Lawyers Guild will serve as a front for the merger), at the December 27-31 SDS National Council meeting in Ann Arbor. Complete merger of the three groups is projected for the June 1969 convention."

The statement went on to assert that the main barrier to the merger was the presence of PL and offered critical support to PL while demanding that PL reverse its anti-LC views and oppose any exclusionary procedures to groups like the SDS LC.

The statement, written on the brink of the Ann Arbor NC, was a clear olive branch to PL and offered LC support to PL if PL would end its attempt to disband the NY Regional SDS Labor Committee. PL clearly refused to do so. It may have been felt that to publish anything in *New America* before the Ann Arbor meeting would only inflame matters further but that after Ann Arbor the LC had nothing to lose.

In his 22 January 1969 *New America* piece, Papert more modestly returns to the idea of a CP-New Mode takeover when he writes: "As PL was eased out, the anarchists, as they have come to be called, planned to merge SDS with a 'Radical Caucus' leaving the Communist Party and with the National Mobilization Committee Against the War in Vietnam. Now we may never see the results of its political alchemy: the intended purge victims [Papert means PL] surprised even themselves by appearing at the four-day Conference with a near-majority in voting strength."

### **NEW AMERICA DEFENDS THE LABOR COMMITTEE**

What seems likely, then, is that the UFT and Socialist Party took strong note of the fact that the New York Regional SDS Labor Committee was the one faction inside SDS that actually backed the UFT. By sometime in mid-to-late November 1968, members of both the UFT and the Socialist Party decided to give the Labor Committee a promotional push in the pages of *New America* as an example of a "pro working-class faction" inside SDS, which *New America* argued was largely now in the hands of anti-working class spoiled suburban children who snobbishly looked down on ordinary workers. (PL used similar arguments but from a "Third International" point of view.)

Yet for some reason, either the LC or the SP decided not to run part two of Papert's projected article. Yet I did discover a 22 April 1969 story in *New America* entitled "Philadelphia Police Arrest Young Radicals" that sympathetically covered the Fraser-Borgmann frame-up. The article was written by Paul Feldman, the editor of *New America*. In his article Feldman cites a statement from Papert "a member of the N.Y. SDS Labor Committee, whom some Socialists know from his group's support for the recent UFT strike." (Feldman doesn't mention the fact that Papert also had an article in *New America* just three months earlier.)

Feldman writes about the LC: "Although we disagree with a number of the ideological and strategic concepts of this group, our experience with members of the SDS Labor Committee are that they have a principled position against the use of violence. . . . The

SDS Labor Committee has dissented from a number of New Left positions such as opposition to the UFT (SDS effectively disbanded the Labor Committee for failing to go along with national SDS policy which favored Community Control and strike breaking against the UFT). It may find it difficult to get meaningful support from those quarters that usually come to the aid of the New Left.” Feldman concludes by giving the addresses for the defense committees in both New York and Philadelphia (“c/o Dillon, 212 W. 22nd St.” or “Frazier [sic], 4946 Cedar Ave. Phila. . . . Make checks payable to their lawyer, Bernard Siegel”).

But who was Paul Feldman?

Besides being *New America* editor, Paul Feldman was then married to Sandra Feldman, a leading UFT official who would actually become the UFT president after Shanker stepped down. From a CPUSA family, Feldman wound up being recruited into Max Schachtman’s Independent Socialist League while he was a student in Brooklyn College in the mid-1950s. Feldman then followed Schachtman into the Socialist Party. He later became one of the founding members of SDUSA in the 1970s.

If I am reading the tea-leaves correctly, starting in the fall of 1968 not just the New Left syndicalist crazies but the CPUSA itself looked on the Labor Committee with real hatred. Recall in 1968 the “Yankee/Cowboy” argument promoted by Carl Oglesby who argued that SDS should work with the “leftwing” of the ruling elite as much as possible to get Bobby Kennedy elected president. (Tom Hayden shared a similar view.) From the viewpoint of the CPUSA, such a policy would have laid the basis for a “popular front” alliance that would end the war in Vietnam with a U.S. withdrawal. Needless to say, the idea of a “New MOBE” takeover of SDS was also related to the attempt to use SDS in a larger Pop Front strategy.

### **“PORTRAIT OF A UTOPIAN-REFORMIST CHARLATAN”**

Other “Old Left” sects also believed the Labor Committee was headed in a social democratic direction.

In February 1972, the Spartacist League (SL) paper *Workers Vanguard* published the first of a two part series attacking the Labor Committee entitled “Crackpot Social Democracy.” The SL argued that the LC was effectively serving as an apologist for trade union bureaucrats. To the Spartacist League, the LC “seeks to fill the vacuum created by the complete discrediting of traditional American social democracy. Ten years ago, young political activists who thought in terms of supporting strikes in cooperation with the local union bureaucracy, of pressure groups designed to expand medical care for the poor or to maintain rent control, joined the Young People’s Socialist League or the early anti-communist SDS. However, the blatant chauvinism of the trade union bureaucrats revealed by their slavish support to the Vietnam war and the disclosure that the liberal anti-communist front groups favored by Norman Thomas and Co. were funded by the CIA [the subject of George Morris’s 1967 book – HH] completely discredited these forces. This left a clear field for political formations not

tainted by McCarthyism and the stultifying Cold War atmosphere of the Fifties but catering to the same reformist impulses. By terming a student-based propaganda campaign to oppose a transit fare increase a 'proto-Soviet,' Marcus seeks to give a revolutionary façade to the kind of politics traditionally associated with the Democratic Party and 'socialists' of the Norman Thomas-Bayard Rustin brand.

"Mirroring the New Left's contempt for organized labor, the Labor Committee performs an essential task of all social-democratic ideologues – providing an excuse for the conservative politics and sellouts of the union bureaucracy by arguing that they simply reflect the backwardness of the workers and the inherent limitations of unions as social institutions."

After a long quote from the NCLC's 1971 *Strategy for Socialism* document arguing against the old CP policy of "boring from within," the Spartacist League continues: "Michael Harrington or Irving Howe couldn't have said it better, including the attack on reds ('professional insurgents') as irresponsible, unrealistic, hopelessly isolated elements in the unions."

The *Workers Vanguard* article also quotes from an LC article entitled "Trade Unions Today" in the Spring 1971 *Campaigner* to prove its point: "Any rank-and-file grouping which assumes power in his [the 'bureaucrats'] stead would be forced to more-or-less similar practices because of the ordinary petty conservatism and backwardness of the average union member." The Spartacist League comments: "The position is clear: the workers get the leadership they deserve!" In short the Spartacist League argued that LaRouche was not an actual revolutionary but a crackpot kind of social democratic reformist. Or to cite the title of a December 1971 Spartacist leaflet: "*The Poverty of Marcusism: Portrait of a Utopian-Reformist Charlatan.*"

A few years earlier in his 16 December 1968 *Bulletin* article, "Many Theories of L. Marcus" article published shortly before Papert's appearance in *New America*, the Workers League leader Tim Wohlforth also paints LaRouche not as a revolutionary but as a crackpot social democratic reformist guru. Wohlforth claims that the LC's national employment policy to create some four million new productive jobs was a "transitional program" meant to reform capitalism -- not overthrow it. "Marcus is clearly a man of another era. How happy he would have been in the old FDR brain trust." Since the LC advances "reform demands limited by the existing capitalist structure, in no way does Marcus differ on this question" from Kautsky or Ernst Mandel. Even worse is the idea that one can use "the capitalist corporate income-tax system for our own purposes in our own way" as LaRouche argued. Wohlforth comments: "never before has a single man compressed into such a short statement so much revisionism." Like Khrushchev and Brezhnev, LaRouche ignores the challenge of the violent seizure of state power for the path of a chimerical "peaceful road to socialism."

As a non-revolutionary, LaRouche totally ignores the central issue of "the party." Wohlforth continues in his Healy-like way, that we need a party that is "conscious, disciplined, yes, disciplined, particularly and harshly and cohesively disciplined. We are

speaking of a Leninist party.” In contrast, “Marcus’s programmatic understandingly demands of him that he organize a loose propaganda group which he hopes someday will lead to an ever looser mass organization which will have confidence in L. Marcus’s ability to administer the Federal Reserve System.” For LaRouche, then, the party is just “a cadre grouping of revolutionary intellectuals.” But such a group only will import pragmatism and bourgeois ideas into the workers movement.

About two weeks after Papert’s article in *New America*, the 12 February 1969 *Bulletin* reported that “a longtime SDS Labor Committee member” named Tom Gordan gave a paper attacking the LC for “reformism.” It is hard not to suspect that Gordan’s attack on the LC for “reformism” didn’t take into consideration Papert’s article in *New America*.

Looking at the Spartacist league and Workers League critiques of the LC, it seems clear that both sects believed that the LC was fundamentally not a Marxist revolutionary grouping with a Leninist cadre structure but a kind of proto-social democracy more in the tradition of the Second International or the “Popular Front” “revisionist” politics of the CPUSA. Seen from the point of view of the CPUSA, the LC may well have appeared as a sinister attempt by the Second International to reestablish an “anti-communist” presence inside SDS.

## **THE CP AND THE PHILADELPHIA LABOR COMMITTEE**

The LC’s involvement in the New York teachers strike would profoundly affect the organization’s future. First of all, the LC’s support of the UFT made it anathema in Black Nationalist circles. When the Penn strike arose in Philadelphia in January 1969, the Penn administration – as we have seen in an earlier post – easily used the Black Student Association to help end the strike.

It also seems clear that in Philadelphia the CP and its allies took aggressive measures to destroy the LC. From a January-February 1970 *Campaigner* article entitled “The Return of the Pop Front”: “A Pop-Front candidate for City Council in Philadelphia, this past November [1969] conspired with City officials and police agents to disqualify his SDS Labor Committee opponents from the ballot: in the process they set up the Labor Committee for charges of criminal fraud and forgery. His actions were supported by a CP apparatus deeply involved in the campaign, various militants from the swamps of cultural nationalism, and member of several super-revolutionary ‘anti-racist’ left groups. Thus it took five days to even find a lawyer willing to file an appeal on the Labor Committee’s behalf. Literally dozens of left-liberal attorneys (some with CP affiliations) refused to handle the case. Some were Pop Front fund raisers, others (from the ACLU) were campaign activists, still others ‘ideological’ supporters of the Pop-Front effort. Two lawyers took the case only to drop it 24 hours later, one doing so ‘in the interest of the movement.’ ‘Leftists’ who had information bearing on details of the frame-up kept mum. Simultaneous with an official announcement of the City’s intention to prosecute us for fraud and forgery, there appeared an article in a quasi-radical weekly written by a ‘fellow socialist’ Wharton Professor of Finance [almost certainly Ed Herman – HH]. Besides

containing a sly, spineless defense of Pop-Frontism, this potpourri of slander managed to call us ‘agent-provocateurs.’”

## CONCLUSION

As we have seen in an earlier NMF, the LC’s pro-UFT stance enraged the syndicalist proto-Weatherman wing of SDS. All the smoke generated from that conflict, however, can obscure the fact that the LC equally worried the CPUSA for somewhat different reasons. Behind these concerns lay another one. Just a year before, Israel and its Arab foes fought the June 1967 War. The war had an enormously polarizing impact on the Western European and American Left. After 1967, the majority of the New Left – as well as Moscow – turned against Israel and endorsed the Palestinian cause. Throughout New Left circles in the world, PLFP airline hijackers become heroes.

For decades Jewish radicals played a significant role inside the left in both American and Europe. Many of them had joined the Left in opposition to the rise of fascism and anti-Semitism. Now Moscow had seemingly reversed course and supported groups that called for the total destruction of Israel. The turn against Israel only energized Second International opposition to Moscow as well as to the New Left. Inside the Old Left socialist movement, it seemed possible that a group like the LC could emerge as a kind of “social democratic” and Second International-allied “New Left” counter to the Soviets and the even more wild pro-Palestinian Cubans and their Tri-Continental allies. Given the outbursts of anti-Semitic statements from some proponents of “community control” during the 1968 strike – outbursts that the UFT immediately seized upon to discredit the local Ocean Hill-Brownsville Board – the LC posed a potential real problem. Now with the Tony Papert article in *New America* and Paul Feldman’s piece calling for donations to the Fraser-Borgmann Defense Committee, a possible LC-SP “popular front” seemed not a complete fantasy.

If the CP had its own agents attending LC meetings, they even would have encountered the mysterious “Myron,” the extremely pro-Israel man with no right hand but whose left hand seems to have signed a good many checks over to the LC. Even if Myron simply turned out to be a harmless eccentric, it would not be hard to imagine someone with a “Comintern” mentality thinking otherwise. (On Myron, see Old Mole File, post #2300.)

Yet by 1971 when George Morris launched his new attack on the LC, much had changed. First off, there was no SDS, there was virtually no PL, and after the disaster of the March 1970 townhouse bombings JJ got kicked out of the Weatherman and Mark Rudd got a one-way free ticket to obscure exile in sunny Arizona. While black cultural nationalists continued to organize inside the ghettos – much like RYM II continued to spawn countless Maoist sects – the CP and its Pop Front allies had largely turned the major media – and the Left’s – focus on the Black Panther Party and Angela Davis and not on groups like Ron Karenga’s anti-Panther black nationalist United Slaves (US).

With the collapse of SDS, mass opposition to the war was now in the hands of two “old Left” outfits: the SWP through its Student Mobilization Committee to End the War (SMC)

and the CP-allied Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice (PCPJ). Both were essentially “pop front” organizations and the CP and SWP were now far more friendly rivals than bitter enemies. (In a sense, the very coalition that the Labor Committee had warned about in its 16 December 1968 statement had come true but not through SDS but only after the demise of SDS.)

However what had most changed in 1971 when George Morris attacked the LC was the SP itself. The most significant divisions that had developed inside the SP from 1968 to 1971 came in the two factions of the SP allied with the trade union movement.

As we have seen, the “left Shachtmanite” faction headed by Michael Harrington allied more with the old Walter Ruther “CIO” tradition while the “right Shachtmanites” drew even closer to the George Meany-AFL wing of organized labor.

By 1971, resistance inside the left wing of organized labor to the war in Vietnam now made it possible for a leading figure in the UAW to appear at an anti-war rally in New York with the likes of Mayor Lindsay and CP-friendly local unions. In short, the “left Shachtmanite” branch of the SP was now pursuing its own opening to a dialogue with Moscow much like the SPD’s Willy Brandt was doing in Germany with “Ostpolitik.” Harrington’s wing of the SP also encouraged the rise of “Eurocommunism” and pointed both to “Prague Spring” as well as “Eurocommunist” trend in Italy as models for a new rapprochement with the CPs without betraying the social democratic tradition. (In America, needless to say, the tiny pro-Eurocommunist tendency inside the CP led by figures like Dorothy Healy was completely marginalized by the CP National Office which took both its playbook and payroll straight from Moscow.)

For someone like George Morris, then, even if the LC really were a creature – or even a creation – of the Second International, by October 1971 even the leftwing of the Second International’s labor movement was willing to enter into some kind of working relationship with its longtime rival to end the war in Vietnam.

But how did the LC respond?

Instead of joining the coalition and burying the hatchet with Lindsay over the events of the fall of 1968, it distributed leaflets denouncing Lindsay and attacking the popular front. To someone like Morris it would appear that the LC was still doing the “AFL-CIA’s” dirty business.

Yet even George Morris couldn’t imagine that some 18 months later, LC goon squads would be physically attacking CP members in brutal organized assaults.

Of course no one in the LC could imagine it either.

## **RESEARCH NOTES:**

### **THE LC, THE NEWARK STRIKE, AND THE RISE OF “SECURITY”**



In early 1970 the LC became involved in yet another teachers strike, this time in Newark, which the organization saw as a repeat of the same union-busting tactics used by New York City only this time with LeRoi Jones/Amiri Baraka playing the role of Rhody McCoy. The other twist was that the head of the Newark Teachers Union was a black woman named Carole Graves whose union was one-third black.

In 1970, the LC's involvement in support of the Newark teachers led to the publication of Carol LaRouche's *The Disadvantaged Teacher*. During the 1970 strike, Baraka's cultural nationalists threatened teachers on the picket line. During this strike action, the union was supported by the UFT and Socialist Party. Long-time SP leader Bayard Rustin even went to Newark to speak in support of the teachers although Albert Shanker wasn't invited as he was too controversial a figure.

As for Baraka, as the East Coast leader of Ron (Maulana) Karenga's United Slaves (US) organization, he not only opposed the teacher's demands for better pay; he also argued that the union was hopelessly corrupt because it taught "white" assimilationist values to black children instead of reaffirming their Afro-centric identity. Baraka had made an alliance to back Ken Gibson as the first black mayor of Newark. Baraka hoped that Gibson in return would let him revamp the entire Newark education system to promote Karenga's Afro-centric belief system.

In 1971 another far more violent strike action broke out in Newark. In the 11 week strike, some 2000 teachers were arrested by the city and Carole Graves was also threatened numerous times. Needless to say, Baraka's cadres helped spearhead attacks on the teachers. It was during this strike that the LC stepped up its efforts in support of the teachers. In turn, the union began working with the LC and a teachers union spokesman named Orie Chambers spoke at LC-sponsored events.

Support for the Newark teachers also included members of the local chapter of the Black Panther Party.

Because Baraka was the East Coast leader of Karenga's US, he was despised by the Panthers. Panther leader David Hilliard and Huey Newton declared that cultural nationalism was ideologically linked to "reactionary nationalism" similar to the notorious Haitian "fascism" of "Papa Doc" Duvalier. According to Newton, Papa Doc "oppresses the people but he does promote the African culture. He's against anything other than black. . . . He merely kicked out the racists and replaced them with himself as the oppressor." Newton then said that many black nationalists in America "seem to desire the same ends." As for US and Karenga in particular, the Panthers and US fought a kind of sub-rosa war across the nation after US gunmen killed two BPP members in Los Angeles. However following the Cleaver-Newton split in the BPP, the pro-Newton forces still left in the East Coast wing of the BPP seemed fairly weak.

As the spokesman for Karenga's belief system with its Seven Principles of Kawaida, Baraka promoted Karenga's views about all topics including Karenga's belief that the

natural role for black women was to be submissive. Baraka also tried to develop his own paramilitary force known as the Simba Wachunga (Young Lions).

Incredibly, in 1969-1970 Baraka became a leading force in Newark politics after he made a deal with Ken Gibson, who would become the first black mayor of Newark replacing then Democratic Party Mayor Addonizio, who was then under federal incitement for corruption and extortion. Gibson's campaign came with the endorsement of the "New Politics" wing of the Democratic Party. On 16 June 1970, Gibson became mayor of Newark. For Baraka, the door now seemed open to promote his Afro-centric Afrikan Free School as a model for Newark's educational system.

As virtually the only leftist sect to support the Newark teachers, the LC first sponsored an event in February 1971 where Orie Chambers spoke for the NTU. *New Solidarity* also reports that an NCLC member was attacked by a Black Nationalist pro-Baraka supporter in late February 1971 – I believe at the University of Michigan. Another NS report says that on 25 July 1971 an LC member named Marsha Freeman was thrown down the steps at a Detroit SWP meeting for her attack on Baraka and defense of the NTU.

In late December 1972, *New Solidarity* began publishing the first of a long series of articles attacking Baraka. With some change and additions, the series would eventually be published in August 1973 as a pamphlet under the title *Papa Doc Baraka: Fascism in Newark* by Costas Axios and Nikos Syvriotis. The pamphlet was based on extensive research work by the NCLC. The NCLC's work on Baraka was subsidized indirectly by the NTU which bought copies of NS to distribute to its members and others inside the community.

It was during the long Newark campaign that LC organizers came under physical attack by the Simbas. In turn, the LC began organizing "defense squads" to fight back. These defense squads were also organized on a national basis given that LC members had been attacked by Black Nationalist backers of Baraka in other cities. The defense squads, in turn, formed the nucleus for "Security." LaRouche used the same apparatus for his attacks on members of the CPUSA in April 1973.

It would be a bitter irony, then, that after LaRouche launched the disastrous Operation Mop-Up, the LC's support in the NTU quickly vanished. In June 1973 long-time LC supporter and NTU leader Orie Chambers even denounced the NCLC and Operation Mop-Up in the pages of the *Daily World*!

[For more on Baraka: See *Amiri Baraka, The Autobiography of LeRoi Jones* as well as Komozi Woodard, *A Nation within a Nation: Amiri Baraka (LeRoi Jones) and Black Power Politics*. In his autobiography, Baraka says that the Prudential Life Insurance Company actually did give his group money for a voter registration drive but that the powers that be decided that he was too much trouble and cut him out of any real influence by 1973 at the latest. As he puts it: "We saw how a small group of blacks, a little petty bourgeois bureaucratic class, got over at the expense of the rest of us. We

saw how the little 'verticality' created by the election had got one group of blacks over, a tiny group, while for the rest of us the struggle had to go on with not much change. We were seeing class struggle in reality." By 1974, Baraka had more or less renounced his Black Nationalist adventure and became a Third World Marxist Maoist.]

## **RESEARCH NOTE: THE SPARTACIST LEAGUE TAKES ON THE "RATS" IN THE LC**

On 9 March 1972 there was a debate scheduled between the LC's Tony Papert and Joseph Seymour for the Spartacist League. Before the debate the SP devoted two long articles in *Workers Vanguard* in the February and March editions of their paper entitled "The Labor Committee: Crackpot Social Democrats." The most interesting Spartacist description of the LC comes from part one of the series and it is worth noting if only to get a sense of how a rival sect viewed the LC.

Although I've quoted from some sections of the article in the main text, here are a few more examples of the Spartacist League attempt to analyze the LC:

"The 'National Caucus of Labor Committees' of Lyn Marcus, known for its apocalyptic visions and schemes for instant socialism, has become something of a New Left fad. . . . Marcus's positive appeal, apart from his dependence on prevailing ignorance, stems from a particular amalgam of New Left Utopian ideas and impulses within traditional social-democratic reformism. . . ."

The Spartacists then say that "What the Labor Committee shares with the New Left world-view is the belief that revolution is easy and instant if one could just find the new gimmick, tactic, posture, propaganda line or organizational form that will bring American bourgeois society tumbling down like the walls of Jericho. Marcus's position that the devaluation of the dollar marks the collapse of the capitalist system; Wohlforth's assertion that the Attica uprising means 'the revolution has begun'; Charles Reich's claim that the U.S. revolution is already taking place in the hearts of its youth – all represent typical idealist projection of one's own desires onto reality. On the organizational level, the Labor Committee's 'proto-soviets,' the Workers League's November 12 'general strike' and the Weatherpeople's terrorism are all aspects of the frenzied petty bourgeois 'revolutionary' make believe."

Comparing the LC with the French Utopian Socialists, the article later continues: "the two major currents of nineteenth century Utopian socialism were technocracy and consumerism. Technocracy (Saint-Simon) maintains that the fundamental problems of society can be solved by allowing production to be rationally guided by scientists, engineers and the like. Consumerism (Proudhon) held that the fundamental issues of social conflict are lowering rents, taxes, and interest and expanding government-provided services. Technocracy raised the technically trained petty bourgeoisie above all social classes, while consumerism made an amalgam between the petty bourgeoisie and other classes, particularly the industrial proletariat."

“Marcusism is a remarkably pure amalgam of Saint-Simon and Proudhon, including the latter’s fixation with money, befitting a failing shopkeeper. Marcus’s attacks on union parochialism and his pseudo-Hegelian terminology are employed in a sustained attack on the leading role of the industrial proletariat in the socialist revolution. Everything Marcus writes on this subject has but one purpose: to dissolve the working class into some broader social category which explicitly includes the lumpen proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie, particularly the intelligentsia.”

However the SL’s most interesting role came during Operation Mop-Up when the SL paper *Workers Vanguard* (WV) published some of LaRouche’s crazy internal documents. In a 27 April issue of WV, an article entitled “Scientology for Social Democrats” reported that the LC’s “crackpotist side” had suddenly reached “truly bizarre proportions. Long marked by one of the most grotesque leader cults among the petty-bourgeois radical organizations, the Labor Committee has now run right off the rails as Marcus’s self-inflating posturing reaches new heights which can only be termed mystical, and perhaps downright clinical.”

WV then cites from a 20 March NCLC internal document by LaRouche entitled “*Whoa, Boy*” at length. It begins: “You are a revolutionary cadre because you are 5-6% human and only 95% or so muck.” WV also cites another LC internal by Steve Pepper entitled “*The Proto-Swamp: the Phenomenology of a Recurring Disease and its Cure*.” Here Pepper writes: ‘Only Lyn has achieved that relationship to creative mentation where death alone can destroy his capacity . . . I experience Lyn’s recent letter to the Germans like a powerful tonic from which I draw deeply, succoring myself from the confident flow of his creative energy.’”

WV then comments: “Marcus himself was, of course, always something of an eccentric, with a strong tendency toward petty-bourgeois [there’s that word again – HH] personalism.” But in the view of the Spartacist League, the roots of Marcus’s madness lay in his affinity with Shachtmanite thinking! “The elevation of bourgeois moralism and personalism above a class analysis was one of the reasons why Trotsky termed the Shachtmanites the ‘petty-bourgeois opposition’ in the SWP.

According to WV, “it is, in fact, the fundamental philosophical tenet of the petty-bourgeoisie to examine social phenomena from the standpoint of the individual and not the class.” This flaw drove the Mensheviks into the arms of the White Guard, James Burnham to join *National Review*, “Shachtman’s uninterrupted evolution toward and into the rabidly pro-imperialist ‘Socialist Party’ and for Marcus’s path, apparently, into raving lunacy.”

In spite of the Spartacist League’s own crackpot analysis of LaRouche as a Shachtmanite of sorts, WV continued to document the NCLC’s descent into craziness throughout the summer. An 8 June 1973 SL analysis of the NCLC national conference that first launched RYM includes these words: “Marcus, despite his unequalled expertise in the production of non-fulfilling prophecies, remains unflappable in stating exact dates for his crackpot schemes, perhaps because, like Tim Wohlforth of the

Workers League, he and his organization of petty-bourgeois academics manqués always have available as last line of defense the spurious employment of Marxist contradiction to prove that black is white.”

The SL also couldn't let go of LaRouche's writings on psychology. On 7 December 1973 under the headline "Marcus Raves On, Part 2, 'Rats!'" the SL reprints excerpts of a 20 August 1973 NCLC internal document entitled "*Trotskyism as Sexual Impotence*" including the section where LaRouche spent paragraphs ranting on about rats and Madonna-whores and impotent Shachtmanite cults and impotent Trotskyist sects like the Spartacist League.

WV reprinted the sections of LaRouche's writings to show he was loony tunes. Little did the SL imagine, however, that just a few weeks later in late December the Chris White affair would be launched and LC members ordered to say the phrase "CIA rats eat s\*\*t" to prove that they weren't "brainwashed."

## **(GOODBYE NEW YORK! THE NMF MARCH ON . . . NEXT STOP: "BAVARIA.")**

### **Enter and exit "the Bavarians": This nmf looks at "life and death on the left"**

---

This NMF is devoted to the Socialist Labor Committee (SLC), the faction of the NCLC that formally declared itself a separate organization on 27-28 March 1971, when approximately half of the organization left. Part one of this report is my attempt to understand the Bavarian crisis. Part two supplies notes from the few post-NCLC writings by the Socialist Labor Committee, which seems to have fallen apart sometime in early 1972. (Note: "Bavarian" -- nickname given to the minority faction -- was meant to recall the more conservative southern wing of the German SPD in the late 19th and early 20th century.)

### **PART ONE: THE BAVARIAN IMBROGLIO**

On 20 January 1971, *New Solidarity* reported on a faction fight at the NCLC's recently concluded national conference. The minority faction led by Philadelphia's Steve Fraser was said to support a "pro-pop-front" alliance with "ruling class liberals" and the Communist Party. The "majority view" held that the US was headed into a future of increased repression and "police statism," an argument the minority dismissed as "Pantherism." The conference witnessed a debate over a "united front" versus a "popular front."

The SLC founding was triggered after Steve Fraser was formally expelled from the NCLC. A story on Fraser's expulsion in the 15-19 March 1971 *New Solidarity* states that Fraser had essentially been running a parallel organization and used his defense committee to secretly reach out to other leftist groups, including the CP-backed Young Workers Liberation League. (The SLC paper *Crisis* reports that the minority was

expelled on 27 February 1971.)

The expulsion came about after the NCLC leadership received two sets of secret minority documents showing that Fraser had established his own separate “steering committee” in preparation for the split. (It has been reported previously on FactNet that Anita G. from Philadelphia accidentally discovered these documents.) NS states that the Fraser group intended politically “to move in effect toward the Communist Party and the ‘new politics’ wing of the Democratic Party.”

The NCLC statement claimed that in late August and early September 1969 Fraser began to look to the “new politics” wing of the Democratic Party after he became a councilman candidate for the “Alliance Party.” Because of Fraser’s local celebrity due in part to the bomb plot charges, his candidacy threatened to draw some votes from other politicians. Using an “undercover agent,” a small number of Alliance Party ballot petitions were “compromised” although a sufficient number remained untainted to still get Fraser on the ballot. Yet “scarcely a single liberal or radical in Philadelphia would join the Labor Committee in protesting this frame up” because the liberals and radicals were backing the candidacy of a “New Priorities” candidate named Tom Gilhool. (We have referred to this incident in the previous NMF post by way of quoting the *Campaigner*.—HH)

Supposedly this incident so demoralized Fraser that he began to fear that his defense in the bomb plot case would also suffer from liberal neglect. Seeing that Philadelphia Police Chief Frank Rizzo had dropped similar bomb charges against black radicals if they left the city, Fraser relocated from Philadelphia for Baltimore in November 1969, hoping that something similar would happen to him.

The NCLC statement claimed that after the April 1969 bomb plot arrests, “not only did the socialist organizations around the nation refuse to come to the support of the Labor Committee’s frame up victims, but, according to Bobby Seale and others, the national SDS leadership acting through Tom Hayden pressured the national Black Panther Party leadership to order a break-off of relations with the Labor Committees. (In an earlier post, we reported from Kirkpatrick Sale’s book *SDS* that the SDS National Office withdrew support from the Philadelphia regional because it was too dominated by the SDS Labor Committee. – HH)

The NCLC claimed that as a result of this second abandonment of support from the local Philadelphia radical community in October 1969 -- on top of SDS’s earlier denial of support to Fraser after the April arrests -- Fraser began to question the NCLC’s strategic approach.

In January 1970, Fraser backed a proposal to create a national publication like the *Guardian* that would be a coalition effort open to different points of view. Most importantly, Fraser “proposed that the Labor Committees subordinate their work and organization to ‘new mass social organizations’ being created by Walther Reuther and others around ecology and reconversion.” In essence, the LC is saying that Fraser

essentially advocated “critical support” to the left wing of the Socialist Party-allied UAW or what one might loosely call the “Michael Harrington faction” of the SP. (Fraser’s January 1970 conference argument was supported by Tony Papert – his former close friend from PL who would break with Fraser and later become a total LaRouche loyalist.)

Although in early 1970 Fraser dismissed the CPUSA as yet another fossilized sect, by the end of 1970 “his policies and his organizational orientation had shifted decisively toward the ‘front’ organizations of the Communist Party.” Fraser even called for support of liberal Jesuit Father Drinan’s campaign in Boston and his followers in upstate New York (Cornell) proposed political alliances with “new politics” groupings there as well. Fraser argued that the Left in the 1940s blew it by failing to ally with the likes of Walter Reuther and that “shrewd socialists” should try to intervene within popular fronts. *New Solidarity* comments: “This point of view was, unfortunately, publicly aired in an abortive effort by a Fraserite to ‘intervene’ within Reverend Drinan’s campaign in Boston and by a miserable, bootleg Ithaca publication which the January 1971 Labor Committee conference publicly repudiated.” After the January 1971 conference when the LC majority moved to end any future debate over these issues, “the Fraser clique went ape.”

One of the most telling phrases in the *New Solidarity* summary has to do with the mention of the Labor Committee “hard core” that turned against Fraser. Obviously that “hard core” was the “old guard” around CIPA had been active in both Columbia and the teachers strike.

In Labor Committee official history, of course, the teachers strike was a triumph for the organization. Yet the LC paid a price for the policy when National SDS even went so far as to encourage the national leadership of the Black Panthers to reject any collaboration with the Fraser-Borgmann Defense Committee. The Labor Committee was also unable to work out any kind of understanding with PLP which seemed determined to destroy it. In fact, the one thing PL and Mark Rudd agreed on was that the Labor Committee had to go. If this was the great tactical victory achieved by the NY LC in the fall and winter of 1968, a few more victories like it might well wreck the organization entirely.

Most important of all, however, was the fact that the LC’s world still revolved almost entirely around SDS. Even pariah status was a kind of status.

After the LC failed to prevent PL from voting with the anarchists in Ann Arbor in December 1968 and the refusal of New York SDS even to consider an LC proposal on “open admissions” in March/April 1969, the LC seems to have thrown itself into a series of frantic organizing campaigns around issues like transit and open admissions hoping to achieve some kind of critical “mass strike” political breakthrough “in the streets.” While the LC managed to string together a series of paper coalitions and even establish a working relationship with the New York branch of the International Socialists, the LC’s independent organizing work failed to produce any significant breakthroughs in 1969 just as its garment center work had failed in the summer of 1968.

But by the summer of 1969 SDS as a national organization had completely imploded. What emerged in the wake of SDS was the end of a separate “student politics.” As the crisis over Vietnam abroad and social breakdown at home spread, new questions arose over issues that the New Left never considered, including the vexing question of the “Popular Front” for lack of a better term.

I believe this new set of problems led to a crisis of sorts throughout the Labor Committee. On the one hand, it seems clear that the Fraser tendency – while not wanting totally to “liquidate” the organization – clearly wanted to reverse what it saw as the LC’s growing isolation within the broader American Left. The sense of dangerous isolation framed within the larger crackup of SDS on a national level led to the emergence of two related but different points of view inside the organization. There was general agreement that with the end of SDS the radical movement was now in low ebb caught between the end of the student movement and the anticipated rise of new labor militancy as the crisis extended even deeper. Therefore the idea was that the LC should focus most on further educating its cadre in Marxism, the dialectical method, “creative mentation,” the history of the labor movement and the like.

The real debate seems to have been how to respond to the coming imagined labor upsurge. Clearly Fraser and company wanted some kind of orientation to the “popular front” based on the LC moving towards leftwing social democratic unions in general and the UAW in particular. The ideological ticket into the labor movement would be the LC’s work on “reconversion.” Hence the Fraser faction developed an aura of “technocracy” about it when it came to the importance of program. It also clearly wanted to keep the LC “decentralized” and not a separate “party formation.” Hence when the expected labor upsurge came, the LC could function more like an “ideological current” inside the mass movement on the side of labor rather than yet one more leftist sect with a fixed “line.”

The “hard core” -- if I am correct -- opposed this view. They argued that precisely because there would be a new inevitable labor upsurge, the LC couldn’t be tied down either by the shackles of the “popular front” or as technocratic advisors to UAW bureaucrats. The expected labor radicalization would make such a policy even more absurd as workers in an upsurge would try to move beyond their narrow “trade unionist” way of thinking. Once the “mass strike” process hit labor, the LC had to function even more as an independent formation. A demoralized Fraser was letting his personal experiences in Philadelphia distort his political perspective.

To the anti-Fraser grouping, the stress on “socialist reindustrialization” and ecology were more magic bullets meant to somehow open doors in a mythical LC-UAW alliance. Besides didn’t the “economic crisis” mean that “all factions” of the capitalist class had to impose “austerity”? Any “popular front” in this period could only function as a kind of conspiracy to trick the working class into accepting “austerity.” Therefore any orientation to the “pop front” was not just bad politics; it was even treasonous.



Nor was this debate taking place in a vacuum. At the very time the crisis with the Fraser faction was coming to a boil, the LC had thrown itself into strike support work for the Newark Teachers Union. Yet the NTU was itself under brutal attack by a “New Politics” government in Newark headed by Ken Gibson with Imamu Baraka as a Black Nationalist stick wielded by Gibson and company to break the union.

In response, the Fraser faction claimed their “positive political tendency” rivals were simply using rhetorical “Pantherism” about the alleged coming of “police statism” and “austerity” as a way to dodge serious argument about the LC future orientation to the Left and the leftwing of the American trade union movement in particular.

This then is my admittedly very limited and tenuous understanding (better still -- guess) of the nature of the LC faction fight to the extent that I can make any sense of it at all. A great deal of the fight remains murky and it obviously involves personality clashes. But I believe the conflict arose primarily because the LC found itself politically disoriented and isolated in 1970 and Fraser felt he had to turn the situation around with some kind of new strategy. The Socialist Labor Committee was his attempt to implement that strategy, an attempt that failed dismally.

## **PART TWO: Notes on the SLC**

On 14 April 1971 the first issue of the SLC’s journal *Crisis* was published. (The Philadelphia LC had produced a journal called *Philadelphia Crisis* so *Crisis* was an extension of this earlier publication.) It reported that on 27-28 March 1971, almost one-half of the former members of the NCLC formed the SLC.

The SLC produced two journals. One was called *Perspectives*. Volume 1, number one of *Perspectives* appeared in May-June 1971. (I have never seen a copy.) The SLC also published the *Journal of Ecology and Development*. (I have never seen a copy of this journal either.)

The first issue of *Crisis* discusses the LC this way. It says that on 27 February 1971, the LC PPT (“positive political tendency”) expelled the minority. It argued that the “strength, self-assurance and audacity of the organized trade union movement” made any attempt to impose austerity on it impossible. Any ruling class attempts to impose austerity would be “instantly stymied” by the working class.

In contrast, the NCLC thinks that strikes during this period would be merely “class defense” and holding actions. The NCLC view of “police statism” is similar to the view adopted during the “Third Period” of the Comintern. Hence the NCLC is falling back on simple strike support work justified by “class-for-itself” rhetoric. This is a kind of “soup pail” defense approach and the NCLC strike support committees are “figments of their imagination.”

As for the Fraser-Borgmann defense work, the NCLC avoided any kind of “united front” approach and just backed a “National Commission of Inquiry” that was little better than

a “pop front.” They didn’t want Steve Fraser to use his position to recruit new members into the LC that might agree with him. Now the NCLC even was refusing to help the SLC with the trial. The NCLC even attacked its own “socialist reconstruction program” and substitutes for it “workerism.”

As for *Crisis*, it was printed on extremely cheap paper. It seems to have lasted for about one year. The last issue I saw was from 21 February 1972 (vol. 1, no. 19). It had an article entitled “Greek Government-Created Fascism” by one K. Pholias, who may have been an “Epanastasi” supporter who went over to Fraser.

However the most curious article in *Crisis* comes from Vol. 1, No. 18 dated 15 January 1971. It is called “Life and Death on the Left” and is written by Larry Kramer and Alan Snitow. Although it is ostensibly about the left in general, its main interest is the LC as a “case study.” It was also written in the wake of the NCLC’s Strategy for Socialism III conference. What is so striking about the article is that it is an attempt at a “BP” approach to politics.

“The LC views the world as a congregation of body-less heads, masses of gray matter encrusted with bourgeois ideology. So it expresses its actual and immaculate sterile vision of Socialist Man. In the spotless, antiseptic halls of future society, the class-for-itself assembles, neatly filing in to take its seat for the semi-annual discussion of how to best allocate the world’s resources. Then it withdraws to pursue the arts, to cultivate the higher virtues of man. For the LC, the kingdom of socialism is heaven and the mundane world of capitalism, inhabited by the lusty, filthy, class-in-itself creatures of bodily excess, hell. Revolution for the LC is paradise regained.

“To the character structure of the petit-bourgeois revolutionary who never really understood the reasons why we split from them, our presentation of the forbidden writers, of psychological and literary attacks on their rationalist conceptions, could only be met with the charge of ‘below the belt socialists.’ Their sly questions about our ‘sexual revolution’ are direct evidence of their own profound emotional and psychological disorientation. Everything about their super-rationalist, ultra-mechanical pedagogical outlook shows their compulsive desire to deny their existence as human beings, to ignore their historical origins, to renounce every part of themselves from the neck down.”

As far as I can tell, the SLC must have produced some kind of theoretical attack on the LC either in their journal *Perspectives* or as a leaflet. This turn to psychological politics appears to have come just as the SLC itself was falling apart as this is the only reference I could find to it in *Crisis*. But since the authors say that LC members made satirical remarks against them, I can only assume that the SLC leafleted the conference with some kind of psycho-sexual analysis of the LC along the lines indicated.

If so, this would be quite fascinating especially if it provoked LaRouche to take up the pen and produced “Beyond Psychoanalysis.”

(Finally, I should note that some members of the SLC later rejoined the LC. I will give their names in abbreviated form: Doug Mal/John Cov/Jim App/Ira Lieb/Kathy Mur/Mary Bail/Art Cas.)

## CONCLUSION

The first “national conference” of the National Caucus of SDS Labor Committees took place in Philadelphia in March 1969. Not long after the conclusion of the third conference held in New York in 1971 the organization shattered. That conference came following a series of confrontations between the “minority” and “majority” factions that resulted in Steve Fraser’s resignation from the National Committee (at this time there appears to have been no “NEC” in existence) on 24-25 October 1970.

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the NC meeting at which Fraser resigned is the fact that we have detailed minutes from it that include a great deal of the heated debate showing that the LC practiced internal democracy. The debate even includes a discussion of how minority and majority factions should act.

In the minutes, a “Bavarian” named Howie Serota asks: “I want some clarification on the word ‘abide’ and what it means not to abide by an NC decision. Are we talking out democratic centralism – what an NC member with a minority position must behave to the outside world as if he is in agreement with the majority? If this is what Lyn means, then certainly the NCLC had no such policy – unless suddenly right now by fiat.

“Marcus: Democratic centralism is a straw man. We don’t have it. We have Carol’s conference motion that when time permits, a referendum can be called. Howie is right about what democratic centralism is, but we don’t have it.

“Fraser: Lyn had not answered Howie’s question which is a legitimate and extremely important one. Just to say we don’t have democratic centralism, doesn’t clarify the meaning of ‘abide.’ Now the NC under certain emergency situations is empowered to make decisions. And certainly the majority of the NC is free to pursue its decisions. But the minority is not obligated to pursue it, endorse, or even keep quiet about it. If Lyn is claiming otherwise, he’ll find no resolution to support his claims.

"Marcus: NC members can state their disagreements with the majority as private persons. They can express differences, but can in no way impede the majority from carrying out its decision. The minority can call a referendum, but while it’s going on, the NC decision is binding. . . . We cannot permit an NC member to ignore an NC decision until the results of a referendum are apparent. . . .”

Fraser then replies: “It is my position that I don’t feel obligated to support, defend, pursue, or even remain neutral or ignore an NC decision I disagree with. There has never been any such rule in the organization. It’s not a crime, it never has been one, and you’ll have a hard time convincing anyone it is.”

Shortly after Fraser's resignation, on 12 November 1970 LaRouche published his analysis of the factional fight in a document entitled "*On Menshevism in the Labor Committee*." LaRouche stresses the cultural and political differences between New York and Philadelphia and argues that the CIPA/Columbia events of 1968 produced a far higher quality of LC cadre in New York.

LaRouche also revealingly writes about his own fear of being "deposed": "Fraser's position as a captive of the Bavarians is also aptly reflected in the ambivalent terms of slander which 'Fraserites' employ in their sly gossip respecting Marcus. The 'over-the-hill' 'new Plekhanov' – the favorite of the New York City branch of the Bavarian Yente – expresses Fraser's current self-estimation of himself as the 'new young Lenin' not quite mature enough to break his leash from his teacher. One appropriately senses something off-key in the image of the 'master tactician' (who built that gigantic organization in Boston this spring), but Fraser precisely sees himself as the tactical genius who depends upon 'Plekhanov' only for abstract theory."

Looking back at the "Bavarians" today, their key legacy remains that they were the last serious organized faction inside the LC that opposed LaRouche. Needless to say, it does not therefore follow that their ideas were somehow right. (My own view is that both sides dramatically misread the "post-SDS" period.) Nor does it mean that following the Bavarian faction fight, the NCLC became a simple rubber stamp for LaRouche.

If one thing is clear in the NCLC's history, it is that the process of transformation of the sect into a cult took place over a series of events lasting almost a year from the April 1973 Mop-Up attacks to the introduction of "BP" theory, to the ultimate insanity surrounding the Chris White "brainwashing" in January 1974.

But if the LC wasn't quite a "guru cult," the fact remains that the national leadership that survived the Bavarian episode did so in agreement with LaRouche. By 1971 some "New York Labor Committee" loyalists had spent almost five years with the group if one traces its origins back to West Village CIPA. None of them would prove to have the prestige or charisma or simple courage to oppose LaRouche in a future crisis.

In fact, the Bavarian episode only seems to have strengthened LaRouche's influence over the organization as a whole.

**(Next stop: Philadelphia)**

---

*Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 08-01-2009 at 09:54 AM.*

## **PHILADELPHIA 1970: Our Last NMF Goes to School and Things Get Tensor**

---

Although the Bavarian split in spring of 1971 affected the entire NCLC, its impact was most felt in Philadelphia. We have previously looked at the post-Bavarian Socialist Labor Committee (SLC). In this NMF, we examine the core of the "post-Fraser"

Philadelphia NCLC. This file will focus most on a group of key LC cadre from Swarthmore College. 1970 would prove to be a crucial year at Swarthmore and provide the NCLC with a remarkable number of recruits that included not just students but faculty members as well. At Swarthmore the LC included at least four faculty members: Thompson Bradley, Dan Bennett, Uwe Henke and Jean-Claude Barre. Henke and Barre would remain in the LC for some time and Henke even became a longtime leading member of the group's NEC.

As for Thompson Bradley, he was a professor of Russian language and literature at Swarthmore. In September 1968, Bradley and some 20 or so other New Left activists (including Bernadine Dohrn) traveled to Hungary where they met with representatives from both the NLF and the North Vietnamese government. Bradley also played an important role in the anti-war group Philadelphia Resistance.

I first met Bradley in the late winter of 1968 when he taught a seminar on "American imperialism" at Resistance headquarters in downtown Philadelphia. At that time he wore a beret with an NLF pin given him personally during his visit to Hungary. Bradley would later author a 27 November 1970 *New Solidarity* article on Frank Rizzo. On 2 November 1970, Bradley also became the temporary chairman of the Fraser-Borgmann Defense Committee. Bradley, however, seems to have distanced himself significantly from the Labor Committee and in the 1970s became active in the New American Movement (NAM).

### **DAN BENNETT (AND FRED NEWMAN)**

The most intriguing radical professor at Swarthmore around the Labor Committee almost certainly was Dan Bennett. On 4-9 March 1973, *New Solidarity* devoted a story to Bennett's failure to obtain tenure from Swarthmore as an example of a radical being purged from academia. Bennett had been schooled in English analytical philosophy and logic and I suspect he played a role in getting Swarthmore to hire Uwe Henke as a philosophy instructor at the college. Henke was a graduate student in philosophy at the University of Pennsylvania working on Frege although he never completed the requirements for a PhD.

In his interview with *New Solidarity*, Bennett reported that "My first contact with radical politics was at Stanford. The core of the department there were people from Queens who had been forced out during the McCarthy period." At Stanford, Bennett worked first as a graduate student under the philosopher Donald Davidson, seen by many as almost as influential on American philosophy at the time as W.V. Quine. As for Davidson, he had taught at Queens College before coming to Stanford. Bennett is credited for influencing Davidson's ideas on a philosophy of action after Bennett returned from a year studying at Oxford.

While at Stanford, Bennett would also get to know Fred Newman, who studied philosophy at Stanford under Davidson. In an essay entitled "*Where is the Magic in Cognitive Therapy? (a philo/psychological investigation)*" available on his web site, Fred

Newman writes: “My earliest discussions with Davidson on these matters came early in the 1960s, while I was still a graduate student and he was justifiably identified as the genius of Stanford’s philosophy department just about to set out to conquer the philosophical world. . . . My Ph.D. dissertation, written under the direct supervision of Daniel Bennett, a brilliant young Wittgensteinian at the time and ironically a former student and then a colleague of Davidson, was a study of the concept of explanation in history.” In 1968, Newman’s dissertation would be published by Mouton under the title *Explanation by Description: An Essay on Historical Methodology*.

Bennett told *New Solidarity* that after he left Stanford, he taught at Brandeis. While there, “I gave a course on Sartre with [then undergraduate] Angela Davis which was not in the catalogue . . . I also taught social and political philosophy in which I discussed the ideas of the Marquis De Sade. One of the things they brought against me was that this was not a standard work.”

Bennett also served as a faculty advisor the Northern Student Movement (NSM). Although overshadowed by SDS, the NSM emerged from a civil rights conference held in the spring of 1962 at Sarah Lawrence College. (It had earlier been more informally known as the “Friends of SNCC.”) In the mid-1960s SNCC became more and more identified as a “black only” organization.

Bennett, however, tried to fight these divisions. “I was the faculty advisor to the Northern Student Movement after the black-white split. At Brandeis we were able to keep black and white together. We organized 200 tutors a week to go into Roxberry, but we realized pretty soon that we could only do this in a larger context of political organizing and education, so we designed a program (which was not in the catalogue) to do political organizing in Roxberry. We used ideas to organize, so it’s no surprise that these ideas were a threat to the ‘standards’ of my professional colleagues who think philosophy is an activity restricted to libraries.” After Brandeis got rid of Bennett, he relocated to Swarthmore sometime in the mid 1960s.

## **“PHILOSOPHY 10” AND TENSOR**

Although Bennett was obviously a radical, he was in no way a “dialectical materialist” or orthodox Marxist. In fact, he seems to have wanted to implement a radical version of his own critique of analytical philosophy. While at Swarthmore, Bennett helped lead a radical faculty caucus of a national group called the New University Conference (NUC), which was established in 1968 as a national organization for radical teachers, grad students and academic staff.

Most amazing of all, however, Bennett – by then acting chairman of the philosophy department – created “Philosophy 10” to challenge prevailing academic orthodoxy. From the 2-6 April 1973 *New Solidarity*: “The Philosophy 10 experience . . . [attracted] to its lectures numerous professors, sometimes involving them in discussions” Philosophy 10 also became involved over a controversy when the Swarthmore Afro-American Students’ Society (SASS) demanded the administration give them a cultural

center that would only be used by blacks.

Again from *New Solidarity*: “Some of the Phil. 10 instructors immediately called a mass meeting of the whole student body. Generally in support of the cause of the black oppressed, they were opposed to the ‘chauvinistic’ ‘community control’ content of the present SASS demand. Consistent with their Phil. 10 work, they knew that no problem could be solved in isolation, but that the resolution to any particular issue was to be found by recourse to the process encompassing it. . . . This ‘holistic’ – or class-wide – perspective put forward by the Phil. 10 members won out as the conception advanced and respected by serious radicals on campus.

“A few days after the initial meeting, an important fraction of the Swarthmore students involved formed the ‘Tensor’ movement. Tensor – from the name of the short-lived newspaper the group published – was the practical extension of the Phil. 10 perspective. Participants in Tensor were essentially seeking to reveal the connection between education and science on the one hand, and socialist organization on the other.

“Philosophy 10 had criticized university education for treating as discrete, compartmentalized bundles of facts, subjects which could be comprehended only as determined parts of a larger, more inclusive process. Tensor leveled this criticism against the basic assumptions of bourgeois education and scholarship.

“Through articles on philosophy, history of science, and economics, Tensor members began to grasp why creative thinking was a necessary component in the development of society and in political organizing. Real creativity lay in the ability to solve concrete problems, to actually alter a situation for the better. . . . In this framework, Tensor sketched the scientific value of philosophy as its usefulness as an organizing tool in building a working-class force capable of saving humanity from the stagnation and collapse implicit in the coming depression. Members of Tensor concluded that the immediate task of education was to further this organizing. This political conclusion sent shivers down the spines of the college’s administrators.”

### **“HOLISM” TO THE RESCUE**

In the summer of 1971, a former Swarthmore student named Joe Horowitz wrote a fascinating article on Swarthmore and Tensor for an education magazine called *Change*. Horowitz points out that when Nixon invaded Cambodia in May 1970 and Kent State and Jackson State then erupted, a group of students and professors launched “their own indigenous version of Marxism that dubbed itself ‘Holism.’ The vanguard of the movement was a group of thirty or so students and three or four professors who had created a Marxist-Hegelian newspaper called Tensor. . . . For most of May, 1970, Tensor monopolized the use of Swarthmore’s student center, where perhaps ten professors and 300 students (at first there were 750, over half the student body) congregated nightly to contemplate their new-found political consciousness. Most of these meetings were truly remarkable. A self-conscious attempt was made to avoid

any sort of stratification or formal structure, and at its best the leaderless group achieved a formidable sense of oneness. . . . Since the philosophy department was dominated by Tensor elements, the movement apparently had a good foothold on the resources of the parent institution.”

Horowitz then summarizes the Tensor critique of liberalism this way: “Liberalism is an ontology of atoms, a worldview that posits a whole equivalent to the sum of its many parts. Liberal social theory views society as atomized. Early liberals saw society as a piecemeal collection of relatively autonomous ‘individuals,’ in our time, there is an updated liberal social theory called ‘pluralism’ that sees relatively autonomous groups interacting somewhat as individuals did in the older model. The ontology of liberalism yields a theory of how we know what is predicated on the functionality of the gap between one atom and another, between the knower and the known, between subject and object.” Needless to say, this same liberal viewpoint informed Swarthmore’s approach to educational pedagogy: “At Swarthmore College, the implicit philosophy of education is based on the epistemology of liberalism.”

In contrast, Tensor’s “anti-liberal thrust” was an all out assault on the foundations of the old system. Again from Horowitz: “In great part, what Tensor preached was merely socialism. But it was also more than that, because by concentrating on the philosophical underpinnings of socialism, Tensor managed to supersede parochial political categories. The distinction between the holistic ontology of Hegel and Marx and the atomistic ontology of James Mill and Swarthmore College translated readily for the group into a distinction between two types of consciousness, the first a quasi-religious transcendence of individuality, the second egocentric, existentialist, and hence manipulatory in its alienated relationship to things and to other people. The catchword was not ‘Socialism’ or ‘Marxism’ but ‘Holism’ – the transcendence of every ontologically atomistic ramification of liberalism. Everything that vitiated the integrity of the whole was suspect. Barriers of all sorts – between subject and object, student and teacher, college and community, between one academic discipline and another, between the school year and the summer, between the academicians and the ‘outsider’ – were challenged in the course of the crisis.

“There was much that was gauche about Tensor. Many of the mass meetings were uneventful; a few were even ugly. . . . But the energy and exhilaration of the strike at its peak were extraordinary and Swarthmore’s communal consciousness was expanded. If nothing else, people discovered the meaning of learning by doing, and concretely perceived the limitations of a conventional liberal education.”

Horowitz describes the key Tensor players this way: “The main thrust behind Tensor came from two members of the philosophy department – Dan Bennett and Uwe Henke; Henke is a Marxist and Bennett is at least a holist. Two Marxists in the modern language department, Jean-Claude Barre and Thompson Bradley, played secondary roles.

“Bennett and Henke were also in great part the driving force behind the New University



Conference and the 'Methods' course. The NUC was a loose collection of 15 or 20 young faculty members who were disgruntled for one reason or another. There was a leftist political faction composed of Bennett, Henke, Barre, and Bradley, and a larger group of professors interested mainly in institutional change at the college. It was the NUC group that concocted 'Methods of Inquiry' or 'Phil 10.'

"The weekly Phil 10 lecture, held in a room so stuffed with people and dogs that it seemed more like an arena than a lecture hall, was a major campus social event, a contest in which the participants vied with one another for attention and notoriety. Informality and lack of decorum resulted in a sense of shared experience, of instruction without condescension. And there was a smattering of content, too: the 'coherent view of scientific inquiry' (the course's alleged goal) that was arrived at was holistic. Phil 10 was an experiment in holism on several levels; it laid the groundwork for the May mass meetings. "

Yet by October 1970, the attempt to continue an alternative pedagogy seems to have collapsed: "Of the remaining five core curriculum courses, the two taught by Dan Bennett – 'Metaphysics' and 'Social and Political Philosophy' – lasted only a month, at which point Bennett and ten or fifteen key students split over personal and political matters. The students, most of whom already lived in Philadelphia, decided to divorce themselves from the campus altogether and began to publish a weekly newspaper 'for workers and the unemployed.' Meanwhile Bennett secluded himself from both Swarthmore and Philadelphia in the little town of Marcus Hook.

Horowitz continues: "Uwe Henke, Jean-Claude Barre, and Thompson Bradley continued to teach but they now devoted considerable time to a leftist political organization in Philadelphia called the 'Labor Committee.' And for two of the three, the future is cloudy. Bradley, unlike the other NUC members has been at Swarthmore for a long time (nine years) and is widely regarded as a permanent 'house radical.' Barre has not been rehired for 1971-1972 because of faculty overcrowding in the modern languages department and Henke's departure seems fairly imminent given his ambitious political aspirations."

Horowitz reports that many people believe the Swarthmore administration wanted to get rid of as many NUC members as possible even though many of them were exceptional teachers: "While nobody claims that everyone concerned in the 'purge' was a terrific teacher and a wonderful person, the group as a whole is superior to the Swarthmore faculty norm. Uwe Henke was once reputedly called 'the finest young philosopher in the country' by a visiting evaluator, and Dan Bennett is the college's most charismatic professor."

## **ENTER THE FBI**

In its discussion of Dan Bennett's failure to gain tenure, *New Solidarity* writes: "The FBI, after investigating acting Philosophy chairman Bennett over the summer [of 1970], staged an armed invasion of a large off-campus student residence in October. In

February [1971], police agents tried to infiltrate one of Tensor member Barre's courses. When the famous Media files were disclosed, the college community had the surprise of discovering that several Swarthmore employees had informed federal agents on the activities of some students and faculty for over a year! *Change* magazine, a Ford Foundation-financed counter-insurgency publication, expressed its interest in Swarthmore by publishing an article on the Phil. 10-Tensor developments."

In his *New Solidarity* interview, Bennett describes the events of 1970 this way: "We saw the [Cambodia invasion] strike as a mass-strike phenomenon, in which it would be possible to spread our ideas by spreading the strike to broader layers. Tensor became a citywide educational and organizing effort. Contacts were with left groups, including the Panthers, in an attempt to include the working class in the strike around working-class issues. The administration was very uptight about the 'outsiders' on campus.

"During the summer [of 1970] the group I was in put out a newspaper and formed an IWW print union. (The IWW was important because it organized employed with unemployed.) I was then put under FBI surveillance with the help of some of the college staff, and later some other people connected with Tensor were raided by the FBI, who were allegedly searching for two Brandeis girls who were supposed to have done something."

Bennett's history is vague. In fact we know when Bennett caught the attention of the FBI because on 9 March 1971 the local FBI office in Media, Pennsylvania, was broken into and files stolen. The Media raid first exposed the FBI's COINTELPRO operation. The files were published in the March 1972 issue of the pacifist *WIN* magazine.

The FBI interest in Bennett came from the Bureau's interest in the "two Brandeis girls." that Bennett mentioned. They were Susan Saxe and Katherine Ann Powers. They were part of a gang led by a black ex-con turned "radical" bank robber named Stanley Bond. On 23 September 1970, the gang took part in a bank robbery that resulted in the killing of a Massachusetts police officer named Walter Schroeder. A few days earlier, the same group broke into a National Guard armory, stole some weapons, and firebombed the place. (After being arrested in Philadelphia on 17 March 1975, Saxe would also plead guilty to the 1970 robbery of a Bell Savings Bank in Philadelphia as well. I don't know if the larger gang was involved in the last robbery but it does establish that Saxe was in fact in the Philadelphia area sometime in 1970.

The FBI opened its inquiry on Dan Bennett on 11 November 1970 after "a Boston informant" furnished information that Bennett "might have some contact with the subjects," meaning Saxe and Powers, both of whom had gone underground. The FBI report reprinted in *WIN* was based on sources such as Swarthmore's security officer as well as the college's chief switchboard operator. They failed to find any dirt on Bennett besides of the fact that he angered Swarthmore's administration by not getting permission ahead of time to bring Philadelphia Black Panther Party leader Reggie Schell to speak on campus in October 1970.

Yet the FBI believed that there might have been some support network for the fugitives if the reports of the raid on an off-campus site by FBI agents cited in *New Solidarity* is accurate. However, there is zero evidence to suggest that Bennett favored terrorism and it may be that the falling out between Bennett and some ten to fifteen of his non-Labor Committee-influenced students in Tensor mentioned in the Horowitz piece may have been over the issue of terrorism.

As someone who came from Philadelphia, I also had a certain connection to at least some of the events described here. As I mentioned earlier, as a junior in high school I attended Thompson Bradley's seminar on U.S. Imperialism taught at Resistance in the late winter of 1968 into the early spring of 1969. Although Bradley was some kind of amorphous Marxist in a New Left sense, his course did not feature Marx's writings. In fact for our overview of America, we read a long chapter from F.S.C. Northup's *The Meeting of East and West*. Other books included Carl Oglesby's *Containment and Change*. I remember, however, that the upcoming publication of the *Grundrisse* in English with a translation by Martin Nicholas was mentioned so Marx's ideas were very much in the air.

As a high school senior, I was allowed to do an honors history project and took the subject of the history of Big Bill Haywood and the IWW as my topic. In early 1970 I also attended a class at a "Free University" held on the campus of the University of Pennsylvania advertised on "Marxist anthropology" because I wanted to learn more about Marx. As it so happened, that course was given by a Swarthmore anthropology senior and LC member named Peter R.

Although I didn't know it then, it seems obvious to me now that it was organized in part around issues raised in "Phil 10" which at the time would have completed its first fall semester. The key book for the course was the International Publishers edition of Marx and Engels' *The German Ideology*. However the course also included Ludwig Feuerbach's *The Essence of Christianity* as well as Feuerbach's *Principles of the Philosophy of the Future*. Today I suspect this was part of a "holistic" "Phil 10" attempt to revisit the emergence of "Marxist humanism" and to follow how a "philosophy of action" had emerged from Left Hegelian "holism."

As an anti-war activist, I remember almost by chance first encountering the Labor Committee as a specific political and programmatic organization around the same time I was taking the course when I attended a massive anti-war conference organized under SMC auspices and held at Case Western Reserve in Cincinnati on 14-15 February 1970. Of the many workshops offered by different sects, I chose one advertised on "industrial reconversion" that turned out to be sponsored by the Labor Committee.

However during that spring I was not involved in any LC organizing and spent my time on my IWW study and some work as a researcher on an Resistance-AFSC project to push a major Philadelphia-based insurance company named INA to divest from South Africa.

In early May 1970, Nixon invaded Cambodia touching off a “mass strike” across the nation’s campuses, a strike that led to the killings at both Kent and Jackson State.. In his book *The People of This Generation: The Rise and Fall of the New Left in Philadelphia*, historian Paul Lyons writes that “The massive response to Cambodia and Kent State marked the peak influence of the New Left and peace movements in Philadelphia.” There was a massive rally at Independence Mall to protest the invasion and shootings. I left my high school on the day of the protest as part of the student strike to attend the afternoon rally. As fate would have it, one of the speakers at the rally was none other than “Lyn Marcus.”

Looking back at the event there seems to have been something curious about LaRouche being there. He was introduced as someone who would speak briefly on “Nixon’s repression in Greece” and the ties of Spiro Agnew and a businessman named Tom Pappas to the Greek military junta. And this is exactly what he did. Yet LaRouche also happened to be the leader of the Labor Committee, one of whose leading members – Steve Fraser – was facing a long prison sentence for the fake bomb plot concocted by Frank Rizzo’s police. Yet for whatever reason LaRouche for once in his life stayed on topic and never mentioned Fraser as far as I can recall. (I should also add that when I first saw LaRouche he was wearing his characteristic “bow tie” and suit.)

While I was at the rally, Peter R, Anita G, and some other people I had met at Peter R’s class at Penn recognized me. They told me that on this very night LaRouche was scheduled to debate a Swarthmore economics professor named Frederic Pryor on campus and offered to drive me out to hear the debate. The debate with Pryor took place around 8 pm at an old Quaker meeting hall on campus. (Although it seemed very well attended, I personally can’t remember anything of great significance said by either side.)

The real adventure of the evening actually began after the debate ended when many of us marched down to the Swarthmore Student Union, the Phil 10/Tensor home base. I remember seeing signs for “Tensor” and wondering what the word meant except as some term in math. I was even more puzzled by posters warning about “the impending international liquidity crisis.”

It was now at the Student Center that LaRouche (with Carol held captive) would engage in a question and answer session with somewhere between 50 to 75 students. I remember LaRouche stunning me by discussing a point that he said Marx made “in the fourth volume of *Capital*” as I was under the impression that it was a three volume work. (LaRouche, I later realized, was referring to the *Theories of Surplus Value* which in a sense is a fourth volume of *Capital*.) LaRouche literally talked for hours and by the time my own party left for the ride back to Philadelphia around 5:30 AM there were still about 15 or 20 people engaged in discussion with him.

Although this was my one and only foray into Swarthmore at the height of the strike, it was a remarkably intense and fascinating experience not so much because of what was said but because of the sheer intensity and sense that what was being discussed in the

Student Union. If I had to sum it up, seemingly abstract and esoteric ideas now took on a kind of urgency NOT because LaRouche was particularly charismatic or impressive – although I remember him as being someone who seemed extraordinarily well read in Marxist theory – but because the events we were living through seemed so epic. To put the matter another way; it simply wasn't that LaRouche was so mind-blowing; in fact his debate with Pryor struck me as boring. It was commonly experienced reality of the last week or so in particular that had proved so mind-blowing.

## CONCLUSION

Seeing LaRouche at Swarthmore and feeling the intensity of the historical moment, it would seem almost impossible to imagine that the LC would in the course of the next seven months tear itself apart. And yet that is exactly what happened. As for me personally, after encountering LaRouche first hand, I actually lost track of the Labor Committee, although I now realize that this was in part because the LC itself imploded.

I first remember regularly going to LC meetings held in a room at Penn's student center some time in the spring of 1971. I missed in its entirety the bitter factional struggle that led to the emergence of the SLC although I do remember seeing Steve Fraser speak on behalf of the SLC at some political meeting that spring. When I attended my first national NCLC conference at the Beacon Hotel on the Upper West Side of Manhattan in late May 1971, it was the first major LC gathering to take place after the Bavarian expulsions.

The LC that I remember in Philadelphia in the spring of 1971 as I became more and more to think of myself as a member seemed clannish. Many members were still tied to schools like Swarthmore or Bryn Mawr in some way yet many of the key cadre lived in Powelton Village near the University of Pennsylvania. There were virtually no working people that I could recall or even significantly older members.

Although I can't be completely sure, my impression is that many of them were products of "Philosophy 10" and Tensor. Unlike New York where the leadership went through the Columbia strike, fights with PLP and Mark Rudd and the crisis of the teachers strike and more or less held together, the deepest crisis in Philadelphia came from bitter factionalism within.

Speaking somewhat generally, what survived of the Philadelphia NCLC was "NCLC 2.0" in the sense that many members didn't have the intensive political experiences that the initial cadre experienced such as the "bomb plot" frame-up. NCLC 2.0 felt far more a product of the cultural climate of Swarthmore in particular.

The organization I experienced, needless to say, was anything but a cult. In fact, it seemed alarmingly decentralized, disorganized, and almost haphazard. Yet this group managed to hang together in part I believe because they were actually part of the old Tensor intellectual and social network. Tensor and Phil 10 so deeply challenged "individualist" ways of thinking, in short, when Joe Horowitz writes about the Tensor

network: “The catchword was not ‘Socialism’ or ‘Marxism’ but ‘Holism’ – the transcendence of every ontologically atomistic ramification of liberalism. Everything that vitiated the integrity of the whole was suspect” I believe we have to take him seriously.

In some deep philosophical way Tensor tried to transcend the “normal” limits of conventional bourgeois human identity. The Tensor/Phil. 10 experience played out during the incredible crisis that erupted after Nixon’s invasion of Cambodia and deeply affected the core group that would remain with the NCLC, many of them for decades.

The Swarthmore NCLC 2.0 radicals also acted much the same way everyone else at Swarthmore acted – they were intensely dedicated and highly intelligent students who got into Swarthmore in the first place because they so believed in ideas and trusted their teachers. The dilemma of NCLC 2.0 was not that the Tensor recruits were maladjusted; their problem was that they were, if anything, too well adjusted.

But in the final analysis it’s not much fun to be the Teacher’s Pet especially when the teacher insists on treating his pets like worthless dogs.

#### **RESEARCH NOTES: A LOCAL PHILADELPHIA FBI FILE ON THE LC**

Excerpts from a 1970 informant report on a meeting of the Philadelphia Labor Committee that took place shortly before the Black Panther Party organized a famous convention over the Labor Day holiday at Temple University in which an estimated 10-13,000 people (including me) attended. (The famous incident when the Philadelphia police raided the Philadelphia BPP headquarters and stripped members took place just before this gathering.) The stolen file was reprinted in *WIN* in March 1972.

**TO: SAC (100-46556)**

**FROM: SA JOHN T. BLAIR**

**DATE: 9/24/70**

**SUBJECT: PHILADELPHIA LABOR COMMITTEE IS-SDS**

On 9/1/70, PH948-S advised that on Friday evening 8/28/70, he had visited the residence of JOSEPH BERNHEIM \_\_\_\_\_. He added that ANITA GRETZ, member of the Philadelphia Labor Committee, had advised him that a meeting of the Labor Committee was to be held that evening at \_\_\_\_\_. Upon arriving, informant discovered that the meeting was to be held on 9/1; however, he was invited to sit and talk awhile with those present. Present was one (FNU) BENNETT [obviously Dan Bennett – HH], and UVA [sic] HENKE and wife and also DAN WASS\*\*\*\*\* [my deletion – HH]. BENNETT, like HENKE, is reportedly an instructor or professor at Swarthmore College and WASS\*\*\*\*\* is supposed to be a student at Swarthmore. All individuals were sitting around discussing the coming Black Panther Party Conference and smoking marijuana. . . . From statements made by BERNHEIM, HENKE, BENNETT, etc., it would appear that they consider themselves ‘intellectual revolutionaries,’ but are not organizational types and not personally activists.

## FRED NEWMAN AND DAN BENNETT: MADNESS TO THEIR METHOD?

There can be no doubt that Dan Bennett and Fred Newman knew each other at Stanford and that Bennett helped supervise Newman's doctoral thesis and that they both came out of the same philosophical tradition. But did that tradition lead both men to retranslate their views into some doctrine of action? And, if so, did the fact that Bennett was so close for a time to the LC at Swarthmore influence Fred Newman in any way in his later decision first to have his group work in a united front with the NCLC around NU-WRO and then to actually join the NCLC en masse for a few months in the summer of 1974?

The simple answer is that since no one has even been aware of this connection till now, it has never even been raised as a possibility. And one doesn't need W. V. Quine to know that a possibility is different from a probability, much less a proof. It may well be the case that after Newman and Bennett's time at Stanford they never saw or spoke to each other again.

Maybe so but somehow I doubt it.

Both Newman and Bennett believed that their particular brand of philosophy could be translated into real world political and cultural situations. When Newman began teaching at CCNY in the mid-1960s after completing his doctoral thesis, the group he first became involved with in the spring of 1968 was actually called "If . . . Then" in playful homage to analytical philosophy. Bennett also tried around the same time to use "Phil. 10" to develop his own attack on conventional "bourgeois" reasoning. I don't think it unreasonable to wonder if Newman was aware of Bennett's activities at Swarthmore.

After Newman broke with the LC, he published *Manifesto on Method* in 1974. It includes statements like: "Objectivity is supposed to mean more accurate reflection of reality. It doesn't. The methodological, ontological process of positing a distinction between objective and subjective, mind and matter, reality and man's interpretation of reality, is a distortion of reality. The reality is that the mind is a part, a coherent part, of material reality. The alienated dualistic conception of subjective-objective is employed by bourgeois theoreticians (and likewise most Marxist theoreticians) to justify interpretations of reality which serve the interest of the ruling class."

Newman also writes in the same text:

"British Empiricism worked hand in greedy hand with British Imperialism and Capitalism. Two hundred years of British philosophy -- epistemology, ethics, political science -- is but a reasoned attempt to establish and impose the view that self-interest is a basic or natural feature of the human being: the fundamental emotion. The existence of the developing proletarian class is from the very beginning denied. It is denied by the development of a bourgeois theory of mind which ultimately separates all people from each other. Locke's Empiricism turns rapidly into Hume's Solipsism (the position that nothing exists except one's own mind) and Existential Nihilism (the position that nothing

exists). Thus, classes are denied by a theory of mind which entails the total alienation of the "individual." Mill's Utilitarianism is but an abortive attempt of a well-meaning bourgeois lackey to "get people together again" after British Capitalism-Empiricism has "pitilessly" torn them apart. One revealing, significant feature of the development of British Philosophy is the parallel development of epistemology and social political theory. From Locke to J.S. Mill, epistemology and theory of mind deny the existence of self (see Hume and his contemporary version B.F. Skinner) while social political theory (see Bentham, J.S. Mill, and contemporary types like M. Olson, Jr.), is based on rational self-interest. We see that the self-contradictory seeds of its own destruction are present in all aspects of bourgeois Capitalism. Yet we should not be so naive as to suppose that this was simply a communication problem between the British philosophers. The psychological theory based on Hume's destruction of self and the social theory based on Bentham's and Mill's adoration of self in combination serves the bourgeoisie. The elimination of self leads to a picture of the mind as a machine; the development of a self-interest theory leads to a picture of the mind as free. The result is the human being functioning as a free machine. Thus the activity of the human being is controlled."

And again:

"The significance of the "subjective" component of understanding is properly stressed by Marcus. Thus, e.g., he "correctly" points out that "the validity of physical science is subjective, not objective" and "the proof of science is not located in 'experiments,' but in the ideology, the prevailing 'consciousness-in-general' which provides the authority for those conceptions which properly govern experimental inference and the way in which experiments are structured for this purpose." But these observations simply do not go far enough. They are reminiscent of the "enlightened" contemporary philosophers of science (Quine, Kuhn, Goodman, etc.). These theoreticians work to represent the subjective component of reality in a form which fundamentally holds on to a world view which parses reality according to such methodological distinctions as subjective-objective, universal-particular (or, in its mathematical version, set and set member). Indeed, Marcus' remarks (quoted above) are not at all unlike Quine's remarks about the indeterminacy of language in *Word and Object*. There Quine argues against the possibility of totally accurate translation of a given language  $L_a$  into another "radically" different language  $L_b$  (i.e., translation without potential loss of significant meaning) on the grounds that the fundamental subjective/objective dualism historically specifies the language to a particular society  $S_a$ . Now clearly Quine is stopped at this point (actually he is forced into a brand of pragmatism, operationally recognizable as fascism . . . . because his conceptualization of reality is not grounded in the class-for-itself, and the methodological dialectic (or dialectical methodology) that necessarily accompanies the notion of class-for-itself. That is, Quine, in the final analysis is simply another philosopher interpreting the world."

And where would we be without all things "Hylozoic"? Again from *Manifesto on Method*:

"Marcus' theoretical position is a curious amalgam (as opposed to a gestalt) which embodies a destructive contradiction which if not exposed will lead to the self



destruction of the organization. A possible name for the position (a name which captures the essence of the contradiction) is hylozoic dualism. The "substance" of Marcus' theoretical statement is hylozoism (that life and matter are inseparable); but the "form" (more properly, the methodology) unfortunately is dualistic. That is, the methodology upon which the hylozoism is based is one grounded in anachronistic a priorisms which are fundamentally in contradiction with the hylozoic aspect of the position. The problems of the position are difficult to detect substantively precisely because of the fact that the substantive statement is (sometimes) "correct." But the continuous and intuitively, coherent appearance of problems in the practice of the ICLC has sent us back for a closer look at the theory. The closer look reveals the contradiction of hylozoic dualism.

Dualism as a methodological doctrine must be distinguished from dualism as an ontological-epistemological doctrine. Methodological dualism refers to the dualistic breakdown implicit in process of interpreting reality. Indeed, it is clear from this definition that methodological dualism can only be "defined" in terms of itself. Thus, the notion of interpreting reality presupposes methodological dualism. Yet this is seen as no problem from the mathematical perspective of bourgeois methodology since it is true of mathematical systems that the rules justify the inferences and the inferences justify the rules. This manner of circularity is endemic to rationalistic (i.e., bourgeois) methodology. Ontological-epistemological dualism refers to the object of the interpretation, i.e., to reality. Thus ontological-epistemological dualism divides reality, for example, into mental and material components. It should be clear that even the most fragmented world view could not totally separate methodological dualism from ontological-epistemological dualism.

Methodological dualism is so standard in western thought as to be often unrecognizable. Eastern philosophies and western mysticism are the primary examples of philosophies which are not methodologically dualistic. Though even in these cases the comprehension of these ideologies employs methodological dualism and thereby the "interpreted" Eastern doctrine or mystical doctrine is methodologically dualistic. Ontological-epistemological dualism, on the other hand, is not characteristic of all western world outlooks. Realism (Lockian variety) is ontologically-epistemologically dualistic; Idealism (Humian variety) is ontologically-epistemologically monistic; Rationalism (Cartesian variety) is ontologically-epistemologically dualistic; Rationalism (Leibnizian variety) is ontologically-epistemologically monistic, etc. (The point of this bit of taxonomy is to illustrate the distinction between ontological-epistemological dualism and methodological dualism and actual classifications should not be taken too rigidly). All these philosophical outlooks, however, are methodologically dualistic. Only with Kant and Hegel do we see the serious beginnings of attempts to deal with the fundamental contradictions of methodological dualism. And only with Marx do we see this work completed. Thus to locate Marx in a developmental line which, for example, includes Descartes, is a serious and misleading mistake. The real Descartes, far from being a germinal source of the dialectic, is a germinal source of the kind of thinking which Marx put to rest methodologically and which we, as Marxist revolutionaries, must put to rest historically."

Newman also references his early work at Stanford this way: “The non-Marxist literature on these methodological matters is voluminous. The author studied these matters at length during the period 1962-1966 in an unsuccessful attempt to make sense of the problems from a non-Marxist perspective. It is impossible! An artifact of this depressing (though ultimately valuable) attempt is the author's book *Explanation by Description*, Mouton, The Hague, 1968.”

Unless I am completely misreading this, I don't think it is that difficult to see why it might be the case that Bennett and Newman could well have followed a similar philosophical and political path in the late 1960s and early 1970s although further research on this topic is well beyond the scope of the New Mole Files project and this author's ambitions.

**ON THE JOURNAL OF ECOLOGY AND DEVELOPMENT** – Although I mentioned that the *Journal of Ecology and Development* was controlled by Fraser's SLC, the very first issue of the journal appeared before the split and included one article by Bob Dillon and one by Art Castle. It could be ordered from future SLCer Ira L and was published in New York City. I believe the first issue came out in the summer of 1970.

**BALTIMORE:** The OMF and NMF have concentrated on the early history of the LC in New York and Philadelphia with the exception of looking at Zeke Boyd's history both inside the BPP and the Baltimore LC. Although New York and Philadelphia were the two key cities unquestionably for a study of the very early LC, a more inclusive look at the history of the organization would have to take a closer look at Baltimore as well.

---

*Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 08-03-2009 at 11:34 AM.*

### **FILES CLOSED: Conclusion to the OMF/NMF Series**

---

In both the Old and New Mole Files series, I have provided some snapshots of the very early history of the NCLC starting from LaRouche's “Leninist Boomer” s SWP pre-convention document to the reconsolidation of the organization after the “Bavarian” crisis.

From 1971 to April 1973 the NCLC experienced a significant rate of growth in the wake of the downturn in the broader anti-war movement and the overwhelming re-election of Richard Nixon in November 1972. Although the greatest benefactors in the world of left sectarians were actually the RYM II Maoists, a number serious activists “in it for the long haul” whose radicalism went beyond anti-war protest, joined the NCLC.

As the Spartacist's 1972 critique of the LC indicated, to many the LC appeared to be a kind of “left social democratic” activist organization in practice whose primary form of organizing involved strike support work along cross-class lines. In fact, the NCLC seemed remarkably free of a hard dogmatic worldview commonly associated with orthodox Marxist-Leninist sects that stretched from the far shores of Trotskyism to

Maoism's exotic climes.

It was this embryonic organization that would be forever wrecked in April 1973 with the launching of Operation Mop-Up and LaRouche's relentless drive for one-man rule.

With a new spurt of cadre growth nationally, the NCLC began to change. Although it is easy to look back and say the NCLC was a "guru cult" early on, this makes very limited sense. Like countless other members of Marxist sects, when LaRouche broke with the SWP, Workers League, and, finally, the Spartacist League, he did so with his own "political perspective." From the very beginnings of Marxism as an organized movement with the rise of the SPD and Second International, the idea of political dissident leaving an organization and starting a new one with a different programmatic point of view has been the norm, not the exception. Trotskyism, in particular, remains notorious for this Anabaptist-like approach.

Therefore it is not surprising that as the founder of the LC's basic political perspective, LaRouche would hold a prestigious position. However in the pre-1973 LC, his power was exercised in a "charismatic" but not "authoritarian" (much less "totalitarian") manner. Yet for all his charismatic exercise of power in a Weber/Michels sense, LaRouche's influence had been sharply challenged by Steve Fraser.

From 1971 to 1973, the growth of the LC would in a more subtle but more threatening way also challenge LaRouche. As the organization grew, it became more and more impossible for one man to dominate the NCLC. Growth in any movement leads to some form of bureaucratization and larger "centrist" structure that takes the group away from its "Mom and Pop store" origins. At a certain point in any dynamic political grouping, factional debates arise and are resolved either by democratic majority consensus and/or split.

LaRouche knew that his charismatic power as "leader" was based on the conviction that he was ideologically correct. Yet his most beloved hobbyhorse – the notion of impending capitalist collapse – clearly had been a mistake. In August 1971, LaRouche's Marx/Triffin-inspired "international liquidity crisis" came and went. Although the Bretton Woods system in fact collapsed, the larger world economy didn't.

The NCLC's self-anointed "genius" had been wrong.

For someone whose influence was largely based on his charismatic claim to special knowledge, this was a huge potential problem. In a sociological sense it meant that LaRouche's "aura" as a leading Marxist theorist – a view he wasn't shy in promoting -- had come into doubt. Normally when something like that happens in any field, the person who made the claim loses some of his or her special social status or "aura."

As we have already seen in LaRouche's paper on "Menshevism in the Labor Committee," he feared most of all being relegated to the shelf as just an "old Plekhanov" by some rising young "Lenin." Even worse, this crisis of influence happened at a time

when LaRouche lost his private income, so to speak, when his common law wife Carol abandoned him in 1972 for another man. Since LaRouche had no job and hadn't had a paying job for some years, one can only presume that he managed to pay his rent on Carol's Morton Street apartment where he lived until sometime in early 1974 from money provided by the Labor Committee. If so, he was literally a "ward" of the organization as well as its leader.

In my view, such pressures may well have helped lead LaRouche first on a subconscious level to his disastrous decision to destroy the NCLC as a successful cadre organization and convert it into his own one-man cult sandbox starting with Operation Mop-Up. Possibly the last chance the organization had to reverse the disaster would have been at the December 1973 internal conference. Yet by then the combination of "Beyond Psychoanalysis" sessions on leading members as well as the witch hunt hysteria generated inside the conference by the "Chris White brainwashing" destroyed even the possibility of an organizational change of course. In short, by January/February 1974, the LC's dramatic devolution from sect into cult became irreversible.

Both the Old and New Mole Files, then, examine the period before the plunge. If we take the NCLC as existing political tendency from LaRouche's first classes at FUNY in 1966 till today in 2009, the organization has been in existence for some 43 years. For some seven years it operated as a controversial but viable leftist sect. For some 36 years, it has functioned as a one-man totalitarian cult with elaborate "security" measures in place to make sure it stays that way.

Of course the Old and New Mole Files are merely snapshots of the LC's very early history. They are clearly subject to revision and informed critique. Nor can any real history of the NCLC be written without an examination of FOIA material from both the regional and national offices of organizations like the FBI. As we have seen, in Baltimore the FBI clearly had a policy of driving a wedge between blacks and white in the radical movement. It would also be interesting to examine in more detail the Philadelphia police department's decision to frame Fraser and Borgmann to determine whether or not the cops acted in coordination with any federal agency beforehand (although given Frank Rizzo's track record he hardly needed encouragement from Washington to frame up local radicals).

Those research questions aside, I believe the key to the LC's early years lies not so much with the fact that LaRouche was a terribly unique character but that in a way he was so terribly common. After all, the SWP and its spin-off organizations produced dozens of dissidents who later formed their own tiny cadre groupings after leaving the party. Yet what proved critical to LaRouche's success was the time itself, the mid-1960s, a fact which I have tried to document in considerable detail in both the Old and New Mole Files.

Starting first with FUNY and then Village CIPA, the Labor Committee leadership in New York went through a stunning series of developments culminating in the bitter attacks on

the organization by the rest of SDS over the New York City teachers strike. Meanwhile in Philadelphia, the sect's leader, Steve Fraser, was hit with the "bomb plot" conspiracy charge in April 1969 in an obvious attempt to destroy the organization there as well. Yet most remarkable of all, the LC's two leading deadly enemies, the RYM I "Action Faction" and National Office crazies and PLP's orcs -- by the summer of 1969 had destroyed both SDS and their own futures with it even as the relatively tiny NCLC emerged somehow still intact from beneath the rubble.

From 1969 to 1973, the two "dominant" tendencies on the non-Maoist American Left were the American Communist Party --- less through its party organization but through its larger support network in the "New Politics" wing of the Democratic party -- and their "Trotskyist" (at least on paper) rival, the SWP. Although the SWP/YSA had by far the largest number of actual cadre, the entire SWP/YSA structure rested on anti-war organizing through SMC as well as its ever-fawning "support" for various "identity" politics formations. Of course if you were black, female, gay, lesbian, bisexual, Chicano, Native American, etc. and were committed to a New Left politics of identity, surely it made more sense to be an activist in your own sub-group rather than a small cog in a larger Trotskyist machine. By the mid-1970s, so many SWP members left the organization and embraced their own new identity that the group began its increasing spiral ever downward into well-justified obscurity.

As for the CP, it too was on shaky ground. The CP unrelentingly supported the "Popular Front" against the war and it promoted virtually anything that would fractionally aid the group's master, the Soviet Union. However the great "New Politics" candidate in the 1972 elections, George McGovern, suffered one of the most crushing electoral defeats in American history. Meanwhile in Ken Gibson's "New Politics" Newark, the new Democratic Party establishment found it could both oppose the war in Vietnam and try to break the teachers union at the same time, much as John Lindsay had tried to do in New York City in the fall of 1968.

In such circumstances, it is not hard to imagine the NCLC gradually becoming more and more the very "left social democratic" reformist organization its critics had claimed it already was in practice. With the rise of NUWRO in 1972-73, it can be argued that the NCLC was essentially on this path and remained on it until the events that first began in early April 1973.

As I close the Files, I'd like to return one last time to Ed Spannaus and Bob Dillon, two key early organizers for LaRouche who first knew him from FUNY. We start first with Ed Spannaus.

In March 1973, Ed and Nancy Spannaus saw with NUWRO the national implementation of the kind of "cross-class" politics they had been thinking about ever since their days as graduate students at Columbia's School of Social Work. As LC leaders, they had in seven years helped create an organization that challenged the old CP-influenced NWRO. And the CP knew it; hence the bitter CP attack on NUWRO during NUWRO's successful founding convention in Philadelphia in late March 1973. If NUWRO had

continued to grow and the NCLC continued to work in alliance with other left groups like the PSP and the New American Movement, the LC would continue to evolve from a small sect to an even more viable leftist political organization.

Instead, a few days following the NUWRO founding conference, LaRouche launched "Operation Mop-Up." Within a few short weeks, the LC again became a pariah organization, NUWRO lost any chance of becoming anything but another hollow NCLC "front," and in early June 1973 Newark Teachers Union leader Orie Chambers even denounced the NCLC in the pages of the *Daily World*.

Finally, I'd like to conclude this series with a few words about Bob Dillon, who may have been the very first person LaRouche ever recruited into the organization. Dillon had been an undergraduate anthropology student at Columbia in 1966 when he attended LaRouche's classes at FUNY. He helped bring LaRouche's ideas into Columbia some months before the 1968 strike. He then played a leading role in founding Columbia's "Liberation School" that summer where LaRouche debated with the likes of Mark Rudd. Now a graduate student, Dillon left New York in the early 1970s to carry out anthropological field in Iran for his Ph.D. When he finally returned to the city in the spring of 1973, he walked into the disaster of Operation Mop-Up and LaRouche's attempt to assert total control inside the organization.

Dillon was appalled by what he saw.

In late December 1973 when the "Chris White affair" happened, Bob Dillon was one of the few people not caught up in the frenzy. He even tried to warn his friends in the organization that things had now gone haywire. When LaRouche found out what Dillon was up to, he set his Security Staff on him. After accusing Dillon of being a secret CIA agent, the Security Staff Praetorian Guard began making threats against him, threats that Dillon took so seriously that he contacted the police to tell them that if he was beaten or killed, LaRouche would be to blame.

Then if the 1974 report by Dan Jacobs and Marian Kester that I previously quoted from in a file is accurate, Bob Dillon finally decided to flee New York City in fear of his life.

**END**

*HH/4 August 2009*

**Research Note:** If the reader wishes to continue further into the history of the LC, there is no better source than LaRouchePlanet. At that site, you can examine original documents as well as selected chapters from a study of LaRouche that includes some earlier personal history and also follows the course of the LC through the Chris White Affair until the late 1970s. Anyone with more detailed research questions and who is not already on FactNet also can contact me at [hylozoichedgehog@gmail.com](mailto:hylozoichedgehog@gmail.com) and I will answer them if I can.

---

Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 08-04-2009 at 01:10 PM.

### Footnote on High Flying Fred Newman

As I was curious about Fred Newman knowing Dan Bennett, I looked up Newman's *Explanation by Description: An Essay on Historical Methodology* (The Hague: Mouton, 1968) , which I had mentioned. At the time of publication Newman was teaching at CCNY but he had been teaching at Western Reserve University after presumably getting his PhD from Stanford. In his preface he says he is deeply grateful to among others Donald Davidson and Daniel Bennett. (That's the Swarthmore guy.)

Curiously Newman also writes: "I wish to acknowledge the United States Air Force Office of Scientific Research (grant No. AFOSR-529-65) which covered some of the expenses incurred in the preparation of the manuscript."

The preface is dated New York City January 1966.

### THIS IS PART OF A FACTNET DISCUSSION OF THE HISTORY OF THE LC

Quote:

Originally Posted by **larouchetruth** 

*How true, how true, how sadly true. Thanks again for the wonderful research, and for the feedback.*

I think the real difference we have is that I feel you are too much projecting post-1973 LC reality to the period between 1966-73 and then trying to read back and say that the LC was a cult in the making because LaRouche had a "totalist" world view as indicated by his classes.

My view is that this is a "*post hoc ergo propter hoc*" view: "A fallacy of false cause, so called because it concludes that what occurs after an event occurs because of that event." I think this is because you too much decontextualize the LC from its time of origin.

Marxism by definition offers a "totalist" world view -- that's its calling card -- and as a Marxist, LaRouche was acting true to this tradition. If anything, LaRouche had a more "open" view of Marxism that was not at all unique to him but also reflected the time. One obvious example, the "Freud-Marx synthesis" that you saw everywhere from Fromm to Marcuse to Norman O. Brown, to LaRouche and Fred Newman and the notorious Freud-Marxian "Sullivanians" on the Upper West Side. This was an attempt to open Marxism up by which was meant a more modern way of thinking about Marx than the sects from the 1930s promoted. This was the world of the Socialist Scholars Conference, this was also why LaRouche called himself a "Marxian" as opposed to a "Marxist" because he was trying to distinguish himself from a deterministic view popularized in the 1930s while remaining very much in the tradition of Marx,

Luxembourg, Trotsky, etc.

This time your comments are in bold:

**[No argument that Lyn's ability to create a political sect was common. If that's the sense in which you meant to use "common," I agree. But I understood you to be saying that Lyn per se was a pretty common type of political sect leader or guru, and that's where I contend that he created a unique type of sect cum cult, with a unique type of psychological appeal, and that the corpus of his writings, and the political gestalt they formed, was also unique in its degree of eclecticism and originality seen against the frame of "Marxist" thought and writings.]**

Well it was unique in the way all sects are unique. But it wasn't so unique that it was incomprehensible to people who wanted a Marxist world view and found the LC read of Marx better than some other Marxist sect. The LC was very much in the sub-culture of the broader Left. If it were truly unique, this would have been impossible. It would be like a language that only one tribe spoke. That's what it became but it didn't begin that way.

**No argument with the facts you are presenting, but did Kolakowski or Lukacs create a political sect that sought to recruit youth to a cadre organization? Not that I am aware of. It is the issue of taking the particular intellectual elements that LaRouche identified and blended into his gestalt, which struck me, and I dare say most of at least us relatively early joiners, as creating a very powerful cross-discipline consistency and coherence, that I believe set Lyn apart. His was a totalistic framework for viewing all aspects of reality. Did Lukacs aspire to such an all-encompassing theory of all? I doubt it, though admittedly I never read him. I am certainly not arguing that no one but Lyn presented intellectual substance. Far from it. I would hazard a guess that the true intellectual content of the better of these guys was light-years more truly intellectual than what Lyn was saying, viewed by us from our present vantage point. Hey, most of them were actually educated, most probably well-educated, unlike Fearless Lunatic. If they cited Plotinus, or Cusa, they actually referenced their actual historical importance. (For the record, Cusa is viewed by scholars as a seminal figure, basically bridging between the "medieval mind" and the mind of the Renaissance and very importance for the emergence of the Renaissance, so, once again, Lyn has correctly identified some pretty important, and positive, historical figures with which to feather his intellectual nest.)**

Kolakowski was a Polish philosopher but he was very much involved in Poland's "New Left" and was close to Jacek Kuron among others. (One of the LC early texts was Kuron and Modzelewski's "Open Letter to the Party.") Kolakowski was forced to leave Poland for his views. As for Luckacs, he had a group of intellectual dissidents around him in Budapest, somewhat similar to the "Praxis" philosophers in Yugoslavia. As Marxists, Kolakowski and Lukacs had an all-powerful world view, Marxism. But Marxism was also always subject to reinterpretation in both East and West. Again LaRouche was following a well-trod path.



**But what I am arguing is that I don't believe that any other political group on the left made the adoption by members of such a "big all" "unified field theory" conception of all of human history and all domains of human thought, as the sine qua non of qualified membership. Just because some old SWP farts wrote books that could be called intellectual didn't mean squat to the raw SWP new recruit. Mastering (or starting on the road to mastery) of such writings was not considered the prime job of the new entrant into the Temple. Such organizations, I contend, were content with a very low level of "understanding" on the part of new recruits. All of these organizations had something pretty akin to the old Stalinist "party line" on a bunch of hot button issues, and the sum of these party lines was pretty much what defined membership. Am I right? Contrast that to the LC. The difference in what new members were expected to master and understand, and importance of mastering same, define one of the important ways that I believe the early LC was unique with respect to all other New Left and Old Left groups and sects.]**

The LC was and is a "student" cadre-type organization. It never had a larger base. With the CP and SWP, they actually had a worker base at times and didn't pitch Marxism at such an academic level. But many sects did. The closest example that I can come up with for the LC has to be Raya D.'s News and Letters Group which to this day has a huge Hegel fetish. But the Spartacist League also was super-heavy on theory, just within a 4th International framework. The Workers League/WRP guru, Gerry Healy also fancied himself an expert on Hegel's Logic and wrote much tedious prose on it. As for "all encompassing" -- the Brit CP certainly tried with people like Haldane and Bernal and others to come up with a Marxist theory of science. Needless to say, the USSR churned out this stuff all the time at every level. There were Marxist theories of linguistics, biology, physics, etc. The better and brighter the cadre you were, the more you were supposed to study all this.

**[I don't know anything about the Weiss's, and you haven't provided enough detail for me to get your point here. LaRouche was clearly always so totally self-absorbed that no one, not even Marx, was ever a straightjacket for him. He didn't "get out of" an orthodox Marxist straightjacket, because he was never in one. His interest in early cybernetics was proof of that--looking toward a theory of the post-industrial work force that you have so usefully enlightened us on. Don't understand what you mean by saying that Weiss and LaRouche both thought the Third International could unify? Did you mean that the Fourth International and the Third could unify? I can't think of anything that suggests Lyn ever thought that, or even thought about that. It would have been a non-issue for him, since he wasn't a Trotskyist from the late '60s on, and clearly never aspired to take over the SWP, merely to destroy it and salvage, if possible, its best young cadres (isn't it curious that he effectively never recruited anyone from that group, but instead filched so heavily from the seemingly more mindless, Maoist PLP? Hmmm. ]**

I've posted on Weiss before. Here my point was that like Weiss and SDS and many

others, LaRouche thought the old Stalin-Trotsky division no longer made sense in post-Stalin, post 20th Congress Russia. Hence there was no need for a "Third International" or a "Fourth International." Both ideas reflected outmoded thinking. And there never was a special "one" "orthodox" Marxist "straightjacket." There were dozens of them. Also being interested in cybernetics wasn't unique to LaRouche on the Left. The "*Triple Revolution*" document of 1964 is all about cybernetics and its effect on society.

**My point has nothing to do with getting past the sectarian feuds of the '30s. If anything, LaRouche was more into that than others. My argument is about LaRouche's uniqueness in the way that he crafted a new gestalt on which to base a belief in "socialism," including how such a revolution might actually come about. Again, it comes down to the central importance, in the LC, about every member having to imbibe and "master" the corpus of supposed important intellectual works to be qualified to be a leader or even a useful member. I do believe that was unique.**

In my experience almost every sect, left or right, has a political line/worldview that one is expected to imbibe and master. Some do it better than others.

**[Beg to differ. I think those gravitating to Maoism, for example, were quite content with an emotional cathexis with "third world" struggles, who couldn't care a whit about a philosophic worldview.]**

There were intellectual Maoists, the most famous of whom was Althusser with his "structuralist Marxism." It's easy to dismiss all Maoists as morons but it wasn't true. If you want to see a movie brilliantly going after super-Maoists, see Godard's great film *La Chinoise*. It is based on his meeting young Maoists from Althusser's world. Many leading "New Philosophers" in France who turned against Marxism in the mid-1970s started out as Maoists such as Bernard Henri Levy. Andre Glucksman, etc. Basically they read "the Cultural Revolution" as an anarchist-like challenge by Mao against the bureaucratic Soviet model.

**[And my point is that this was always the case, and I submit the reason for it was the unique way that LaRouche's gestalt penetrated our psychologies, giving us (now them) a staying power, and a power of us, that was unique among the myriad leftist political groups that started in that era. I argue that uniqueness is and uniqueness does. The fact that the LC is unique among the various groups on the scene 40 years ago in still being around, and still large enough to be a public nuisance, still able to destroy young lives by recruiting, etc., etc., is precisely the proof of how unique the LC, and Lyn, were and are.]**

And my point is that the LC's uniqueness came about after it became unmoored from its roots in the Left and drifted off on its own. We just couldn't imagine it in April 1973 when Mop-Up began because our identity was rooted in the earlier period when the LC was a leftist sect involved in political debate with other sects. We viewed April 73 from an earlier model/paradigm formed in the 1966-March 73 period which actually came to an

end in April 73 when the LC began to transform from a sect into a cult.

Where you see more continuity, I see more radical rupture.

---

*Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 08-09-2009 at 03:05 PM.*

*APPENDIX:*

### **Legal Text of the Fraser-Borgmann Trial**

---

Here is an edited version of the Fraser-Borgmann trial from Lexis-Nexis. I tried to cut out a lot of the legal mumbo jumbo footnotes. Also you can see the attempted link to the BPP.

Keep in mind that the Fraser-Borgmann arrest trial was a pivotal event in helping to build the Philly SDS LC. It was far more important in reaching the Left in Philly than anything Uwe did. Uwe may have been recruited himself as a result of involvement with the case.

HH

*Commonwealth v. Borghmann*

*nos. 345-348*

*COMMON PLEAS COURT OF PHILADELPHIA COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA,  
CRIMINAL DIVISION*

*1971 Pa. Dist. & Cnty. Dec. LEXIS 201; 55 Pa. D. & C.2d 246*

*May 13, 1971, Decided*

*DISPOSITION: [\*1] Motion to quash indictments.*

### **CASE SUMMARY**

**PROCEDURAL POSTURE:** The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania charged defendants with possession of explosives with the intent to use them unlawfully against the person or property of another in violation of Pa. Stat. Ann. tit. 18, § 4417 (1947), and conspiracy. The Commonwealth refused defendants' application for disclosure of evidence obtained by wiretapping and electronic surveillance. Defendants filed a motion to quash the indictments.

**OVERVIEW:** Defendants, members of the Students for a Democratic Society, associated with another extremist group, the Black Panther Party, to blow up historical sites that symbolized the nation's birth. Federal agents fed information to local police, which showed defendants' connection to the Black Panther Party, and the plot. In considering defendants' motion to quash the indictments, the court held that the U.S. Attorney General instructed a federal agent not to respond to questions that asked whether federal agents obtained information via wiretaps or electronic surveillance. The court found that it was reasonable to conclude that federal agents intercepted conversations that unveiled defendants' plan. The court held that local police might have seized explosives only after using such information. The court held that if the federal agents illegally seized the conversations, then it was a Fourth Amendment violation that barred the use of tainted evidence. The court granted the U.S. Attorney General an opportunity to provide the requested information on possible illegal wiretaps. The court held that if the federal government refused, then the court would quash defendants' indictments.

**OUTCOME:** The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania was granted leave for 20 days to confer with the U.S. Attorney General. If the Attorney General permitted the agent to provide additional testimony, the court would conduct further proceedings in accordance with its opinion and order. If no permission was granted, defendants' motion to quash the indictments was to be granted, upon motion to the court.

**CORE TERMS:** interception, conversation, electronic surveillance, wiretapping, bureau, intercepted, surveillance, seized, present case, electronic, apartment, telephone, seizure, lieutenant, explosive, tainted, eavesdropping, district attorney, disclosure, special agent's, disclose, Safe Streets Act, suppress, labor committee, searches and seizures, local police, subpoena, tangible, police department, indictment

**COUNSEL:** Arthur R. Makadon, Assistant District Attorney, for Commonwealth.

Bernard L. Segal and David Rudovsky, for defendants.

**JUDGES:** SPAETH, J.

**OPINION BY:** SPAETH, J.

#### OPINION

[\*\*247] September sessions, 1970,  
SPAETH, J., May 13, 1971. --

#### Nature and History of the Case

Defendants have moved to quash indictments charging them with unlawful possession of explosives and conspiracy.

On April 12, 1971, defendants filed an application for disclosure and production of

evidence obtained by, wiretapping and electronic surveillance. Testimony on the application was concluded, after some interruptions, on April 27th. Thereupon, contending that the testimony showed that disclosure had been refused, defendants moved to quash the indictments. Argument was heard, and briefs have been received. 1

----- Footnotes -----

1 Various other motions have been filed by defendants but it is unnecessary to describe these, except that it should perhaps be noted that defendants have filed a motion that the Commonwealth be required to disclose the identity of an informant; counsel agreeing, however, to defer argument on this motion pending the outcome of the present proceeding.

----- End Footnotes-----

[\*2] STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On April 8, 1969, the Philadelphia police obtained a warrant to search defendants' apartment at 4946 Cedar Avenue, Philadelphia. 2 The police executed [\*\*248] the warrant on April 9th, and in the course of searching the apartment they found and seized gunpowder, three lengths of pipe, a plastic explosive and fuse material. They arrested defendant Fraser, who was present during the search, and defendant Borghmann, who arrived shortly afterwards, and two others. On April 18th, defendants, after a preliminary hearing, were held for the grand jury.

-----  
----- End Footnotes-----

When defendants' application for disclosure was called for hearing on April 15, 1971, defendants' counsel stated that they wished to call as their first witness Lt. George T. Fend of the Philadelphia Police Department. Lieutenant Fend was the officer who had obtained the warrant to search the [\*3] apartment where defendants were arrested, and had been in command of the search. The assistant district attorney objected on the ground that in response to defendants' application he had filed an affidavit that " [no] Commonwealth agency employed any wire-taps or electronic surveillance in this case." After receiving an offer of proof from defendants' counsel, and after hearing argument, the court sustained the objection, ruling that defendants' counsel proposed to proceed in too oblique a manner, and that if they believed that the Federal Bureau of Investigation had engaged in wiretapping or electronic surveillance, they should call the appropriate Federal agent.

When the hearing resumed on April 21st, defendants' counsel proposed to call as their first witness Jeremiah W. Doyle, Special Agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who was present in response to a subpoena. Thereupon, Robert N. de Luca, Esq., Assistant United States Attorney, objected on two grounds. First, he moved that the subpoena be quashed, on the ground that defendants' counsel were on a "fishing expedition"; and second, he moved that if the subpoena [\*\*249] were not quashed, the agent should not be [\*4] required to testify until he had had an opportunity to obtain instructions from the Attorney General, Mr. de Luca submitting to the court a copy of regulations issued by Attorney General Ramsey Clark on June 29, 1967, but still in

effect, instructing Federal agents that, if subpoenaed, they should decline to respond until they had received instructions from the Attorney General with respect to the testimony they could give. The court ruled that defendants' counsel must, if they could, offer testimony of persons other than the agent sufficient to show that they were not on a fishing expedition. In response to this ruling, counsel called defendant Fraser, defendant Borghmann and Miss Jane Debra Friedman, who had been arrested with defendants but was discharged at the preliminary hearing. Counsel also offered, and the court received, a copy of the transcript of the hearing on defendants' motion to suppress the items found and seized in the apartment. 3 The narrative that follows is a summary of so much of this evidence as the Court considers pertinent.

----- Footnotes -----

3 Counsel also attempted to authenticate by Special Agent Doyle's testimony a certain document as a copy of a document from one of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's files. Without requiring the agent to testify; the court assumed the authenticity of the document and instructed counsel to proceed with their other witnesses; the court reserving its ruling as to the relevance of the document. In the event, the document was never offered in evidence.

----- End Footnotes-----

[\*5] Shortly after being arrested, on April 8, 1969, defendant Fraser conceived the idea of soliciting the help of the Black Panther Party in California. 4 In pursuit [\*\*250] of this idea, between April 16th and 20th or 21st, he made several three-way telephone calls from his apartment to "my colleagues in New York [City] and the West Coast headquarters of the Black Panther Party..." His colleagues were Steve Komm and Tony Papert. The purpose of the calls was "to establish a meeting with the national leadership of the Black Panther Party, particularly Bobby Seale and Dave Hilliard, to discuss the joint defense of the Black Panther Party and the then Philadelphia SDS Labor Committee." Defendant was a member of the Philadelphia SDS Labor Committee, as was defendant Borghmann, and Komm and Papert were members of the New York SDS Labor Committee. The only persons with whom defendant discussed his plan to meet with Seale and Hilliard, apart from Komm and Papert, were defendant Borghmann and Miss Friedman.

----- Footnotes -----

4 When asked on cross-examination how he happened to conceive this idea, defendant replied: "Well; we had been framed here in Philadelphia for the charges that we are discussing now and the Black Panther Party in our opinion has been similarly framed and we felt that we had a common interest in joining together with them to defend ourselves and other people in the country faced with a similar problem.

"Q Who gave you the specific idea...?"

"A. Oh, it was my idea...."

----- End Footnotes-----

[\*6] On April 23rd, defendant Fraser went to New York City, from which he flew to San Francisco, where he was met by members of the Black Panther Party, who took him to

Berkeley, where he met Seale and Hilliard, either on April 24th about midnight or in the early hours of April 25th, after which he flew back to New York City, returning to Philadelphia on April 26th. 5

----- Footnotes -----

5 Papert flew from New York City to California with defendant Fraser. The record is not clear whether Papert and defendant Fraser made the entire trip together. Also; a George Turner "went on the trip... [and] knew about the plan to go to California." The record does not reveal who Turner is; defendant Fraser testified that he was still in contact with Komm; Papert; and Turner, that "some of them" were in the court room, and that so far as he knew none was an informer for the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

----- End Footnotes-----

[\*\*251] With respect to defendant Fraser's activities, it also appears from the record that he may have come to the attention of the police [\*7] as early as February 1969, when the Philadelphia SDS Labor Committee "initiated a large sit-in at the University of Pennsylvania." The sit-in lasted six days, and was reported by newspapers, TV and radio. Representatives of the news media interviewed defendant, and during the first three days of the sit-in, he was one of those who, as representatives of the students who were sitting in, engaged in negotiations with representatives of the university administration.

Defendant Borghmann and Miss Friedman corroborated defendant Fraser's testimony. Defendant Borghmann testified that he never discussed the plan to go to California with anyone except defendant Fraser. He said he believed the discussion was in the apartment where he and defendant Fraser lived, the weekend before the preliminary hearing. He said that he did not go on the trip because of the expense, adding, "I felt that Steve [defendant Fraser] could represent my point of view in San Francisco." He said the money for the trip came from the New York SDS Labor Committee and that "we were concerned about this particular trip because of the nature of the Government attack on the Panthers, that type of thing, the nature of the [\*8] negotiations, to keep it as much as possible secret."

Miss Friedman testified that she learned of the plan to go to California before the preliminary hearing, from defendant Fraser, she thought in a telephone call, and that she may have discussed it with defendant Fraser one other time in person, but with no one else. She said that defendant Fraser told her not to talk about the plan, and that she made "a distinct effort" not to.

Defendant Borghmann and Miss Friedman also [\*\*252] testified that on April 25th, the day that defendant Fraser flew back from California to New York, an incident occurred that they described as follows:

Sometime during the afternoon of April 25th, the Philadelphia SDS Labor Committee was conducting a rally in front of City Hall to protest the arrest of defendants. Defendant

Borghmann and Miss Friedman were setting up sound equipment when Lieutenant Fenc e up to them, according to defendant Borghmann, "took out his black book in which he keeps notes and said that he hoped that Steve Fraser had a good trip out to San Francisco and that he didn't get air sick. 6

----- Footnotes -----

6 Miss Friedman's version, substantially the same, is at N.T.

----- End Footnotes-----

[\*9] One Larry Elle, evidently also a member of the labor committee, replied that "the only thing that made Steve sick was Lt. Fenc l," and after an exchange between Elle and the lieutenant, the incident ended.

The balance of defendants' evidence was the transcript of the hearing that had been held on their motion to suppress as evidence the items seized in their apartment. An examination of this transcript reveals the following.

In the affidavit in support of the issuance of the warrant, it is recited, in part, that:

"Information received from a reliable source, who in the past has furnished information leading to the arrest and conviction of seven persons wanted by the Police, does so state that there are explosives and explosive devices stored at the above location [defendants' apartment] and that he personally has observed them there. These are to be used to cause extensive damage to life and property at places selected by them in the near future."

"On 4/8/69 information received from the Federal [\*\*253] Bureau of Investigation from their confidential source, that the members of the Students for Democratic Society are planning the bombing of historical sites in both Philadelphia [\*10] and Boston, as these are the seats of Democracy and had to do with the founding of the United States and should be blown up according to their information."

At the hearing on the motion to suppress, Lieutenant Fenc l testified as follows:

The first information that he had received "was maybe around the 15th or 16th of March." "Maybe a day or two" before March 26th, his informant told him that he had seen explosives in the apartment. Starting on March 26th, and until the search, on April 9th, the police had the apartment under surveillance. On the evening of April 7th, Lieutenant Fenc l received a telephone call to the effect that "The FBI was keeping in daily touch with the SDS, and had a tip it had plans to destroy by explosion places in Philadelphia and Boston..." On the morning of April 8th, he "received a copy of a bulletin." Evidently this was an FBI teletype and referred to a meeting on March 30th in Boston touching the use of explosives by SDS... "for the bombing of Historical buildings. It said that Historic sights [sic] in Boston and Philadelphia should be blown up. They included Harvard University, at Cambridge, Massachusetts, University Hall at Boston University, Old South [\*11] Meeting, the Old State House, Boston, and the Nathan Hale Statue."

Defendants were not named as having attended this meeting.



It also appears that Lieutenant Fend may have had other contacts with the Federal Bureau of Investigation. During the hearing on the motion to suppress, he, was asked on cross-examination about "inflammatory matter... being distributed by SDS Labor Committee," after which the following ensued:

[\*\*254]

"Q. Isn't that a fact what that refers to turned out to be an explosion caused by an ex-Marine who turned out to be a psycho as a result of World War II activities?

"A. I did not get the outcome.

"Q. Did you say the bombings were caused by SDS?

"A. I did not say that.

"Q. What did you say?

"A. I said pipe explosives were the type used.

"Q. Where did you get that information?

"A. From public papers, and I talked to an FBI agent who said the same Ming." It is not apparent from the record, however, when this conversation occurred. 7

----- Footnotes -----

7 There is other evidence that at least the Civil Disobedience Squad; of which Lieutenant Fend is the head; had a further contact with the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Defendant Fraser, while being questioned on cross-examination regarding whether he attempted to avoid being followed to California, testified that he did not make such an attempt but that he had later heard that someone had followed him. On redirect examination; he testified that he had heard

"A.... that the FBI requested of the local Civil Disobedience Squad --

"Q. Philadelphia Police Department?

"A. Of the Philadelphia Police Department that since they; the FBI; didn't have a black agent available would the Civil Disobedience Squad provide one to trail me to the West Coast.

"Q. And to your information did it indicate whether the Civil Disobedience Squad of the Philadelphia Police Department honored the request of the FBI for a black Philadelphia Policeman?

"A. Yes; my information is they honored the request.

"Q. Does your information indicate whether or not that Philadelphia Policeman did in fact follow you to San Francisco?

"A. Yes." On re-cross-examination; the assistant district attorney asked defendant the source of his information that he had been followed. Defendant's counsel's objection was sustained and defendant was not required to answer; the court considering that since the Commonwealth was resisting disclosure of its confidential informant, it was only fair; temporarily at least; to allow defendant's informant to remain undisclosed.

----- End Footnotes-----

[\*12] [\*\*255] At the conclusion of defendants' evidence, and after argument, the court ruled that defendants' counsel had shown enough to make it appropriate to permit them

to call as their next witness, Special Agent Doyle. Accordingly, the court denied the Assistant United States Attorney's motion to quash the subpoena pursuant to which the agent had appeared. The court, however, granted the Assistant United States Attorney's motion that the agent be given an opportunity to obtain instructions from the Attorney General with respect to his testimony.

When the hearing resumed, on April 23rd, the Assistant United States Attorney presented to the court a telegram from the Attorney General of the United States, which read, in part, as follows:

"The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has advised me that none of the information furnished by the Bureau in connection with the pending case resulted from any type of electronic surveillance or overhearings of the aforesaid defendants or of their attorneys.

"The Court has ordered that you reappear tomorrow morning in response to the aforesaid subpoena. You or your authorized representative should, of course, appear as required [\*13] and you may testify to the facts set forth in the preceding paragraph. Beyond, that, however, you are hereby instructed to respectfully decline to produce any material contained in the files of the Department of Justice or give testimony as to any information received in the course of your official duties."

Argument by counsel ensued. The argument revolved about the meaning of the statement by the Attorney General that none of the information given the Philadelphia police "resulted from any type of electronic surveillance or overhearings of... defendants... or of their attorneys." As a result, the court ruled as follows:

[\*\*256] "My first ruling is that I assume that the agent would follow those instructions and will not at this time require that he actually take the witness stand and testify as the Attorney General has instructed him to.

"My second ruling is that on that assumption I have concluded that the Attorney General's instructions to the agent are not sufficiently clear for me to make a decision on the legal issues presented by respective counsel's argument.

"My third ruling is that in order that I may be put into a position where I may make a ruling I am going to [\*14] submit to Mr. de Luca three questions with the instruction that he obtain from the Attorney General an answer whether the Attorney General will clarify the telegram that I have just read by answering any one or more or all of those three questions and with the further instruction that the agent shall reappear in Court at 10 o'clock Monday morning armed with those instructions and prepared to testify in accordance with those instructions. 8

"The questions that I put are as follows:

"Number One. The Assistant District Attorney has informed the Court that the only information that he has received from the Federal Bureau of Investigation is the

following:

"On April 8, 1969, information was received by the Philadelphia Police Department from the FBI that a confidential FBI source had told the Bureau that members of SDS were planning the bombing of historical sites in Philadelphia and Boston.

"Question: In obtaining this information did the FBI either directly or indirectly employ any wiretap or electronic surveillance? For example, assuming an informant gave the FBI the information was the informant acting or responding to instructions given to him by the FBI based on information received through wiretap or electronic surveillance?

"Question Number [\*16] Two: Did any Federal agency, Federal agent or Federal employee conduct any wiretapping, bugging, electronic surveillance or other similar surveillance of any wire or oral communications to which Steven C. Fraser or Richard Borghmann were either a party or physically present while the surveillance was conducted, from January 1, 1969, through the date of the preliminary hearing in the case pending before the Court, namely April 18, 1969?

"The third question is this: Did any Federal agency, Federal agent or Federal employee conduct any wiretapping, bugging, electronic surveillance or other similar surveillance of any wire or oral communications to which Steven C. Fraser or Richard Borghmann and their attorneys, Bernard L. Segal and David Rudovsky [\*\*258] were either a party or were physically present while the surveillance was conducted, from January 1, 1969, through April 22, 1971?

"My final ruling is that I note that counsel for the defense have submitted another question in which they ask to be advised with respect to surveillance of any wire or oral communications to which their clients were either a party or physically present while the surveillance was conducted from January 1, 1969, through [\*17] the date of the indictments in this case, namely, September 20, 1970, and I have concluded that as a matter of law there has not been made such a record as would warrant so broad a question.

"Gentlemen, first of all, and I direct this particularly to you, Mr. de Luca, do you have any question about my instructions to you?

"MR. de LUCA: Your Honor, it is my understanding that the Court is submitting to me for transmittal to the Attorney General three questions. It is my understanding that the Court expects one of four possible answers, the first being that the Attorney General will answer all three questions submitted by the Court; and the second, that the Attorney General will answer any two of the three questions submitted by the Court; the third being that the Attorney General will answer only one of the three questions submitted by the Court and the fourth being that the Attorney General will elect to stand on the original answer transmitted to Philadelphia by telegram and already a part of this record.

"THE COURT: That is correct.

"MR. de LUCA: Further than that, Your Honor, I have no questions."

On April 27th, the court was advised by counsel that the agent had received further [\*18] instructions from the [\*\*259] Attorney General, whereupon the hearing resumed, and the agent testified as follows:

"Q. Will you please now state to the Court, Agent Doyld, what your instructions are from the Attorney General?

"A. I have been authorized by the Attorney General of the United States to advise the Court that in obtaining the information which the Federal Bureau of Investigation furnished the Philadelphia Police Department on April 8, 1969, in connection with this case, the Federal Bureau of Investigation did not, either directly or indirectly, employ any wire tap or other electronic surveillance....

"Q. My question is I gather you are not authorized to give any further information than the reply you have just given us?

"A. That is correct."

The agent was then excused, and no further evidence was offered, either by defendants or the Commonwealth.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

On the basis of the evidence that has been summarized in the foregoing statement of the case, it is a reasonable inference that between January 1, 1969, and April 18, 1969, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, either by wiretapping or electronic surveillance, intercepted conversations to which one of [\*19] defendants was a party.

## **DISCUSSION OF THE FINDING OF FACT**

As a rule, at least so far as appears from the cases that counsel have cited or that the court has found, the government states whether or not there has been any wiretapping or electronic surveillance. In the present case, however, the government has declined [\*\*260] to make such a statement. It might be argued that, despite this fact, the court should have found that there was no wiretapping or electronic surveillance; and the argument might go somewhat as follows.

The assistant district attorney has advised the court that no one on behalf of the Commonwealth has done any wiretapping or electronic surveillance. It is apparent from the record of the hearing on defendants' motion to suppress that Lieutenant Fend entered and searched defendants' apartment on the authority of a warrant that depended on two categories of evidence: (1) Evidence learned from an informer, who told the lieutenant that he had seen explosives in the apartment, and from police officers who kept the apartment under surveillance; and (2) a tip from the Federal Bureau of Investigation regarding an SDS meeting in Boston. With respect to the first of [\*20] these categories, there is no suggestion of wiretapping or electronic surveillance; and

with respect to the second, the Attorney General has replied that "the Federal Bureau of Investigation did not, directly or indirectly, employ any wire tap or other electronic surveillance."

These facts, however, would not support a finding that no wiretapping or electronic surveillance occurred. Perhaps they might, if there were no other evidence; but there is other evidence.

The most striking part of this other evidence is the evidence that Lieutenant FencI knew of defendant Fraser's flight to San Francisco. Since the plans for the flight were made over defendants' telephone, it is evident that the lieutenant may have learned of the flight from an agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who had wiretapped the telephone, or had placed defendants' apartment under electronic surveillance. It is further evident that such an agent probably would have intercepted more than one conversation, since wiretapping and electronic surveillance are by [\*\*261] nature continuing techniques, the person conducting them often not knowing when a conversation will occur.

Corroborating these inferences is [\*21] the evidence that the Federal Bureau of Investigation asked the Philadelphia police to provide a black officer to follow defendant Fraser during the flight, indicating that the bureau knew of the flight some time before it occurred. Also corroborative is Lieutenant FencI's testimony, on defendants' motion to suppress, that the Philadelphia police had had defendants under surveillance at least since mid-March 1969, and that in conducting this surveillance they had cooperated with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which on April 7th had passed on to the police a tip regarding an SDS meeting in Boston. Also corroborative is the evidence that defendant Fraser had, at least in all probability, come to the attention of the Philadelphia police and the Federal Bureau of Investigation as early as February 1969, when he had been active in the sit-in at the University of Pennsylvania.

It may be granted, as the assistant district attorney has argued, that the record does not prove, in the sense of proof by demonstration as compared to proof by inference, that any of defendant Fraser's telephone calls to New York City was intercepted by wiretapping or electronic surveillance. Perhaps, for example, [\*22] Lieutenant FencI only learned of defendant Fraser's flight because a police agent assigned to follow defendant followed him to the airport. Such an argument, however, is unsupported by any evidence. No police agent was called to testify; nor was Lieutenant FencI called to explain how he had learned of the flight; indeed, no one was called to contradict either defendants' evidence or the inferences reasonably deducible from defendants' evidence.

Even more significant than this lack of contradictory [\*\*262] evidence is the limited nature of the Attorney General's responses to the questions put to him. It seems fair to conclude from these responses that the information about the Boston meeting, which the Federal Bureau of Investigation passed on to the Philadelphia police, was given to the Bureau by an informer who had been at the meeting, or had talked to some one who

was, and was not obtained by wiretapping or electronic surveillance. However, that is the most that can be gathered from the responses. The Attorney General has not said that in some other aspect of the surveillance, either of the SDS generally or of defendants particularly, none of defendants' telephone conversations [\*23] was intercepted by wiretapping or electronic surveillance. Indeed, he was specifically asked whether there had been any interceptions of defendants' conversations "from January 1, 1969, through the date of the preliminary hearing in the case pending before the Court, namely, April 18, 1969," 9 and he declined to permit Special Agent Doyle to answer. If there were no such interceptions, why has the Attorney General not simply said that there were not? 10

(c) Have defendants carried their burden of proof?

The evidence offered by defendants has been summarized and discussed earlier in this opinion, in the statement of the case, finding of fact and discussion of the finding of fact. As there appears, it is a reasonable inference that between January 1, 1969, and April 18, 1969, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, either by wiretapping or electronic surveillance, intercepted [\*\*284] conversations to which one of defendants was a party. It is now in order to consider the significance of this finding in light of the cases that have been discussed.

The assistant district attorney has argued that the finding is of no significance because he does not intend to offer at trial any evidence that he obtained by wiretapping or electronic surveillance, or even the evidence obtained from the Federal Bureau of Investigation regarding the SDS meeting in Boston at which it is said there was discussion of a plan to bomb historical sites in Boston and Philadelphia.

The assistant district attorney's statement is sufficient to ensure that there will not arise in the present case the situation that arose in *Katz v. United States*, supra, [\*57] where, it will be recalled, the government offered in evidence an intercepted conversation in itself incriminating. His statement, however, is not sufficient to ensure that other situations equally proscribed will not arise.

For example: Suppose that the Federal Bureau of Investigation intercepted a telephone conversation on April 16th in which defendant Fraser discussed his plan to go to California to meet with representatives of the Black Panther Party. It is not enough for the assistant district attorney to say that he does not know of the interception, and does not intend to use it if it occurred. If it occurred, it may include evidence that would be relevant to the assistant district attorney's prosecution. Defendants are charged with having explosives with the intent to use them "unlawfully against the person or property of another": The Penal Code of June 24, 1939, P. L. 872, sec. 417, 18 PS § 4417. HN17Intention is a state of mind that must be inferred from a defendant's conduct, including what he says. Thus, evidence of what defendant Fraser [\*\*285] said, in discussing his plan to go to California, might be relevant, either in an inculpatory or exculpatory sense, as reflecting [\*58] defendants' intentions regarding the explosives.

As another example: As observed in the discussion of the finding of fact, it is not only a reasonable inference that at least one of defendant Fraser's conversations regarding his plan to go to California was intercepted, sometime between April 16th and 20th; it is also a reasonable inference that there were earlier interceptions of conversations to which one of defendants was a party, sometime after the Philadelphia police initiated their surveillance of defendants but before defendants were arrested on April 8th. 19 Again, it is not enough for the assistant district attorney to say that he does not know of such interceptions, and does not intend to use them if they occurred. If they occurred, the search of defendants' apartment and the subsequent arrest of defendants might have been tainted under the principles applied in *United States v. Schipani*, supra, as, for example, might be the case if the informer who told Lieutenant Fend that he had seen explosives in defendants' apartment first learned of the explosives from overhearing a wiretapped conversation.

### **ORDER**

And now, May 13, 1971:

- (1) The Commonwealth is given leave within the next 20 days to confer with the Attorney General of the United States to determine whether in light of the opinion accompanying this order the Attorney General will permit testimony by an appropriate Federal agent with respect to whether from January 1, 1969, to [\*71] April 18, 1969, there were any interceptions, by wiretapping or electronic surveillance, of one or more conversations to which one or both of defendants was a party;
- (2) If within such time the Commonwealth advises the court by letter that the Attorney General will permit such testimony, the court will conduct further [\*\*294] proceedings in accordance with the opinion accompanying this order;
- (3) If no such letter is submitted, defendants' motion to quash the indictments will upon motion to the court be granted.

---

*Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 03-01-2009 at 02:08 PM.*