

Carter Justice Department Preparing Attempted Witch-Hunt Against the U.S. Labor Party

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.
U.S. Labor Party National Chairman

[First published in *New Solidarity*. Re-published in *Executive Intelligence Review*, Volume 4, Number 4, January 25, 1977. View [PDF of original](#) at the LaRouche Library.]

We have been informed through sources of the highest degree of reliability, that the U.S. Department of Justice is presently engaged, in collaboration with the incoming James E. Carter Administration, in preparation of a three-fold, massive attack against the U.S. Labor Party.

This attack is presently scheduled to include, first, attempted frameups on fraudulent espionage charges, second, the use of the Internal Revenue Service for unlawful harassing actions, and, third, the deployment of “radical” groups associated with the Marcus Raskin and William Buckley factions of the intelligence establishment in coordinated harassing actions against the Labor Party.

In view of my Party’s emerging importance in national and global developments, such actions by the Carter Administration would not only represent an act of public urination upon the U.S. Constitution, but would represent a source of major and dangerous complications for the fundamental interests and well-being of the United States as a whole. It is my obvious obligation to expose this filthy business of the Carter forces before it is put into full-scale operation.

I shall limit myself, for the moment, to the implications of the properly-ludicrous, projected “espionage” hoax.

The present military-technological situation of the Warsaw Pact *vis-à-vis* NATO is exemplified by the events unleashed by the recent visit of Soviet physicist L. Rudakov. In short, the Rudakov case illustrates the point that the Soviets are now operating at a qualitative advantage to the U.S.A. in matters pertaining to the scientific research aspects of military technology, whereas the U.S.A. retains a compensating advantage in the development of our electronics-aerospace capability—the latter the very capability which Carter Naderite energy and deindustrialization schemes is presently determined to gut as rapidly as possible.

As leading professionals in this nation and abroad are already informed, my Party has a special sort of authoritative competence in important aspects of this issue. As an outgrowth of my own original applications of the work of the physicist Riemann and the mathematician Cantor to problems of economic analysis, mathematicians and physicists associated with the Party developed advantages of competence in aspects of scientific research generally associated nowadays with the name "non-linear effects." This special competence, together with our energetic work in support of accelerated plasma physics research on behalf of fusion energy development, has situated the Party in a most advantageous position of overview for those recent and current Soviet advances in relevant areas, including our estimates of the military-strategic potentialities of Soviet electron beam and other developments.

In consequence of this knowledge, we are qualified to state that insofar as any party stands to gain military benefits from knowledge of the other's basic scientific research, at this point it is only U.S. intelligence espionage around Soviet targets which has any general net relevance.

The nature of the "espionage" problem was most clearly underlined by the cited Rudakov affair. During the relevant 1976 visit to the U.S.A., Soviet physicist Rudakov found occasion to formally declassify secret Soviet research for a significant group of U.S. specialists. During the same visit, Rudakov proposed to contract production of a Soviet-developed, advanced electron-beam device to U.S. firms. The howling folly associated with the Rudakov visit was the efforts of ERDA circles variously to deny, deprecate, and then wrap a security classification around Rudakov's disclosures! *From precisely whom did ERDA propose to conceal such Soviet disclosures?*

Granted, since November 2, 1976, a number of curious things have occurred. There has occurred an unprecedented rash of sinkings and related mishaps to petroleum freighters along the coasts and rivers of the United States, coinciding with sabotage of major natural gas storage facilities—a package of "accidents" which represents a statistical impossibility according to all extant actuarial tables, but which not-so-mysteriously coincides with the Carter Administration's projected deindustrialization policies. Somewhat less spectacular, the national press has subjected us to a rash of Soviet-spy stories.

Are any of those alleged spies guilty? One can not be certain either way, especially under circumstances of an incoming Carter Administration. It is, of course, a matter of general knowledge that the United States and Soviet governments have formerly regularized, placing a certain amount of routine spying activities on variously a legal or semi-legal basis, under the titles of scientific and technological exchanges and other arrangements. It follows that by merely planting some additional "goodies" into the routine information-exchanges effected through such arrangements, the FBI can at any time generate an impressive spy-scare pattern by closing down some small part of such informal arrangements. No informed and serious

person takes such developments as of any importance in themselves. One says, rather, "I wonder what someone in Justice is up to with this caper?"

The practical implications of the recent mini-scare concerning alleged Soviet industrial spies are all too obvious. As the FBI turns on the faucet generating spy-scare stories for the edification of our national press, the Soviet and other Eastern European officials respond by closing down a comparable number of courtesy arrangements in that region of the world. "They have their spies; we have our spies," both the Soviet and U.S. intelligence agencies observe with an urbane shrug of the shoulders. "If they annoy our spies, we will annoy their spies."

So, as the FBI turns on its spy-scare faucet here, the Soviets react predictably by reducing the number of U.S. agents in place around their premises. How does the Trilateral Commission then react to the obvious, predictable Soviet response in this amusing little game? We hear great howls about "human rights." As if a large number of NATO intelligence-community agents within the Warsaw Pact nations were not variously Dubčekites, pro-Zionists and what-not.

In general, the dull espionage business in itself is of little shock potential to any informed person. On the contrary, over the recent decades, it has become a cynical, professional game, in which the counter-intelligence specialist on each side avoids unduly reducing the number of adversary agents kept "in place." After all, such adversary agents are an indispensable, institutionalized part of the overall counterintelligence game!

Hence, whenever anyone makes a loud noise about spies, one smells something foul afoot—having nothing to do with espionage proper.

Insofar as the specific aspect of the matter is concerned, all of us with a competent overview know that the current scaling-up of spy stories is primarily intended as part of a series of provocations and related operations in Eastern Europe, and, secondarily, an effort to whip up acquiescence to international confrontation politics within the U.S.A. itself. The Trilateral policies to this effect are hardly secret; only an imbecile would disagree with our judgment on this aspect of the matter.

In any case, without a witch-hunt hysteria situation in the U.S.A. itself, any Justice Department frauds against the Labor Party on this account would simply sharpen the cleavage between the United States and Western Europe—whose governments would be thereby more fully convinced of the essential dishonesty and despicable character of the Carter Administration overall.

However, the gist of the Carter Administration's projected "espionage" hoax has a more serious, more substantial aspect. The recent Comecon policy statement concerning convertibility of the transferable ruble, and the associated major policy statement published in the January 1 issue of the Soviet publication, *International Affairs*, has Chase Manhattan Bank and certain mice over at Treasury in a state of panic.

It is not the Soviet monetary and economic policy as such which affrights these debt-overhung gentlemen. The significance of the Soviet and Comecon policies for the transferable ruble is that the size of the Soviet economy gives effective substance to Western European and Arab nations currently accelerating drive to establish a new, gold-reserve-based monetary system outside the International Monetary Fund and dollar-reserve institutions generally. The current process of pegging Western European, Arab and Comecon gold reserves to the current market price of the metal compares with the English Tudors' successful 16th-century operations against the Fuggers and Antwerp bankers, and the attempted similar operations of French minister Colbert during the last half of the 16th century.

At first glance, the emerging new monetary system, like the Non-Aligned resolution adopted at Colombo, Sri Lanka last mid-August, appear to be direct imitations of the U.S. Labor Party's widely-circulated proposal for an International Development Bank. In fact, as representatives of the U.S. State Department and other leading public and private institutions have emphasized to us over the past sixteen months, the U.S. Labor Party's efforts have contributed directly and substantially to the drive among developing-sector and European nations toward a new monetary system modeled upon our International Development Bank proposal. The wide circulation and influence of our proposals have in fact tended to mold the intellectual environment to the effect of creating a climate of selective acceptance for those proposals which coincide with the International Development Bank (IDB) conception.

It should not be said that we have directly caused the current European, Arab and Comecon steps toward a system essentially identical with the IDB. Rather, the influence of our ideas has had a powerful catalytic influence in shaping the intellectual environment in which heads of state and similar leading forces have evolved agreement to this effect.

At the same time, beginning early 1974, the U.S. Labor Party developed exceptional expertise on matters of current strategic policies and alternatives. This was first prominently set forth in our Fall 1974 strategic studies paper, *Rockefeller's "Fascism With A Democratic Face,"* and led to our emergence as a policy-studies agency of widespread accreditation in certain leading U.S.A. and Western European circles of relevance, beginning during the Spring 1975 public debate concerning the Schlesingerian MC 14-4 NATO nuclear-posture

policy. Subsequently, our studies have enjoyed growing influence in many parts of the world, and are today a significant collateral aspect of the U.S. forces opposing the kinds of strategic insanity proposed by the Schlesingerian Committee on the Present Danger and other adjuncts of the Carter Trilateral cabal.

Although it would be incorrect to imagine that we have directly prescribed the strategic postures of opposition to the Carter Trilateral cabal emerging in Western Europe and elsewhere, as in the case of the IDB, our growing influence as a credible leading part of the world's strategic policy-studies community has influenced the intellectual environment in which others arrive at judgments independently of us.

It is difficult to assess the exact degree to which such kinds of developments might have occurred had we not existed. Nonetheless, it is established in the minds of the Trilateroids and others that the Labor Party has directly contributed to fostering such developments, developments which portend the doom of Rockefeller power over the U.S. government, nation, and the world. To the Carterite Trilateroids, the Labor Party represents a novel, dangerous force of undetermined upper potential for influencing the course of events. At the moment, they view the Labor Party as a potentially decisive catalyst for unifying a new opposition composed of conservative Republicans and Democrats allied with large portions of the trade-union and black-minority electorate. On the basis of our electoral campaign, our fight against the massive vote fraud of the Carter forces, and our present efforts to mobilize for an anti-Naderite, pro-industrial energy policy for this nation, the Carterites consider us sufficiently dangerous to their special interests to undertake the foulest sort of subversion of the Constitution in an effort to crush us.

There is only one effective political remedy open to us for dealing with such Carterite subversion of the U.S. Constitution. Granted, there are nominal, formal remedies through the courts, and so forth. However, contrary to the mythical assertion that ours is a nation of laws, the law does not function unless powerful forces are acting to give strength of independence to judges and other relevant agencies—a strength of independence in behalf of the Constitution which was conspicuously wanting at crucial points in the court proceedings around the proven fraudulent election of James E. Carter. The effective approach to such problems is the exploitation of factitious advantage—a technique in which we fortunately enjoy some developed expertise. In the context of Western Europe's growing willingness to bring down the U.S. dollar, and given the present status of the U.S. Labor Party in the eyes of forces abroad, we are determined to make any foul action by the Carter White House an effective means for causing Mr. Carter and his Trilateroids to be ushered from government with greater expediency and the appropriate far more profound humiliation than President Nixon experienced.

In this view, we announce our estimation of the current strategic correlation of forces.

Given the correlation between the vital national self-interests of Western European nations and the emerging new monetary system, the U.S. dollar is on the verge of collapse. The touch of \$130 monetary gold of the new European monetary system will deflate the international reserve dollar like a pin puncturing an overblown balloon.

That will not represent a disaster for our nation. Quite the opposite. The figurative burning of mountains of inflated paper in One Chase Manhattan Plaza in lower Manhattan will potentially free the U.S. government to generate well over a hundred billions of credit for the purpose of real capital formation in industry and agriculture. Under such circumstances, the industrial power of the United States will show itself the most potent single element in the greatest global industrial boom in history to date.

The collapse of the monetary dollar—or, in other words, the collapse of Chase Manhattan and associated institutions—will not in itself represent either a disaster or bonanza for our nation. It will represent a time of unavoidable fundamental choices, between two alternatives. Either we elect to join Western Europe in scrapping a cancerous debt-overhang—in which case we leap into a new era of prosperity, or we dig in along lines pioneered by the Nazis under Hjalmar Schacht, turning the U.S.A. into a fascist, “labor-intensive” state irrevocably committed to early thermonuclear confrontation.

The question before us—the only really important question now before us—is the way in which key anti-Carter forces in the U.S.A. view the existing and emergent global correlation of forces. In fact, we have a favorable correlation of forces in favor of the right decision at the crucial crisis-point rather immediately ahead of us.

The significant present disadvantage of the U.S.A. *vis-à-vis* the Warsaw Pact in respect of actual ABC war-fighting capabilities reflects not only determined Soviet build-up of its own such capabilities and deployments, but the almost willful erosion of U.S. scientific and industrial capabilities over the period since the Eisenhower Administration. (Although such trends did not become predominant until about 1966, 1966 is properly seen as a point of intersection of two trends in developments emergent from the beginning of the Kennedy Administration.) During the 1960s and afterward, the net real capital formation rates in the U.S.A. and development of employed scientific and engineering cadres *have been negative* when measured against the rate of growth which would have represented equilibrium. In consequence of this rotting of U.S. industrial power at its essential basis, the rotting of the commitment to the Idea of Progress, the political and economic power of the United States has been spiraling along a downward trajectory relative to the Soviet Union. The military

strategic capabilities of the U.S.A. have merely lagged in following the general underlying development.

The “aura of power” of the United States during this recent decade-and-half of decline has been maintained chiefly through the Bretton Woods system and its vestiges, the monetary claims of the dollar against global production. At whatever point, therefore, the outer world resolved not to sustain the monetary position of the dollar’s debt-overhang in the old way, the dismal, cumulative reality of the U.S. situation must assert itself. This is precisely the present case, the key to the global weakness of the U.S.A.

However, because of the higher modal level of material culture and education of our population, and because of American habits of productive development, as seen even in the rusting vestiges of our industrial and agricultural capacities, we are still at the point that a turnaround from monetarist to industrialist policy would immediately transform the U.S.A. into the most powerful nation on Earth. Not merely in military terms, but in economic power and political influence. Not as a competitor to the rest of the world, but as the principal source of that outflow of technology on which every other nation’s self-interest actively depended.

The active question, the practical question, is a subjective one, a political question. Does there exist the combination of political forces abroad and in this nation to effect such a transformation?

Do Western Europeans have the courage to bring down lower Manhattan? The recent turn of France’s President Giscard against the Trilateroid’s Interpol Abu Daoud hoax-scenario, the massive scale of projected export credits of the Callaghan government of the United Kingdom, the ongoing role of the Andreotti government of Italy, and active Soviet support for European independence measures portends the answer: They most probably do.

Do we, in the United States, have the potential correlation of forces, groupable around forces in Congress, through which to push through the proper decisions at the moment of crisis? Potentially, we do.

Let us speak the simple truth in defiance of edifying contrary opinion. James E. Carter’s election was effected through probably not less than five millions fraudulent votes, and probably more. He never enjoyed the support of a majority of the qualified electorate. He has far less support today than he had on November 2, 1976. At any point a significant section of the trade-union movement and black minority forces establish working cooperation with a bloc of conservative Republican and Democratic congressional and state forces, Carter’s political base falls to between 20 and 30 per cent of the population, a base principally concentrated in urban liberal circles. With factories closing, households sniffing

and shivering with the latest energy hoax, the bulk of the American people would respond favorably with almost a single voice of support for any credible leadership moving to get the nation's industrial and agricultural machine under way once again.

I will conclude by telling you something. Your initial reaction, one of incredulity, should only illustrate to you your need to improve your understanding of real politics. It is not impossible that I might be in the White House by sometime during 1978, or, at the least that the White House have a new incumbent, not Carter, who will collaborate closely with me to the point of getting the nation out of its present mess. What happened to President Nixon could happen again; it is my firm perception that such a perspective is most appropriate at this juncture.