

dum was reportedly drafted by Charles Baker of the Institute for American Democracy on behalf of Schlossberg and I.W. Abel, Jake Clayman, and Tom Kahn of the AFL-CIO's Industrial Union Department. The Institute for American Democracy is itself a joint venture involving the UAW, the Jewish Lobby's Anti-Defamation League, and the IUD. Schlossberg's pipeline into the FEC leads directly to Chairman Harris, who if former Associate General Counsel of the AFL-CIO, and FEC Commissioner Neil Stabler, a close associate of the UAW and former Chairman of the Michigan State Democratic Party.

Schlossberg is also personally handling one major front in the national campaign to bankrupt the USLP, the UAW's \$30-million trademark lawsuit against the NCLC and its newspaper, *New Solidarity*. To develop his case, Prosecutor Schlossberg has solicited the assistance of FBI informant and former NCLC member, Gregory Rose, in surreptitiously obtaining highly confidential and privileged information on the party's defense.

The NCLC has brought Schlossberg's unethical behavior to the attention of the District of Columbia Bar Association by filing a formal complaint (see excerpts). Schlossberg has made every effort to deflect the D.C. Association's request that he respond to the charges by denying the authority of the Washington Bar to investigate him when similar charges are up for consideration by a Federal Court of New York magistrate.

. . . from the Justice Dept's NCLC File

The following documents were released last week to the U.S. Labor Party by the Criminal Division of the Justice Department, pursuant to a Freedom of Information Act request.

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 23, 1975

To: Director
Federal Bureau of Investigation

From: Richard L. Thornburgh
Assistant Attorney General
Criminal Division

Subject: *National Caucus of Labor Committees*

There are attached hereto, for your information, copies of a letter to the Attorney General from (deleted) information he transmitted concerning the National Caucus of Labor Committees.

* * *
CONFIDENTIAL

September 4, 1975

Edward H. Levi
Attorney General
10th and Const. Ave., N.W.
Room 5111
Washington, D.C. 20530

Re: National Caucus
of Labor Committees

Dear General,

As you know, I have a continuing interest in the above organization. I am enclosing relevant information for you and for referral to the appropriate person in the Justice Department.

Thank you for your interest.

Kind regards,

Sincerely,
(Deleted)

* * *
CONFIDENTIAL

To: (deleted)
From: (deleted)
Re: *National Caucus of Labor Committees*

The NCLC is entering a new, and my judgement, dangerous phase of its development. While the efforts to penetrate the trade union movement are continuing, apparently with only slight success, and its U.S. Labor Party candidates are campaigning for local, state and national office, the central thrust of the operation is changing.

The NCLC is preparing for "Operation Counter Punch" directed primarily at the Maoist Revolutionary Union, and to a lesser extent the October League, Progressive Labor Party and Weather Underground, all with strong Maoist ties...

The NCLC is now openly promoting the positions of the Soviet Union.

Much of the space in its twice-weekly newspaper *New Solidarity* is devoted to propagandizing the Russian positions on the Mideast, Indira Gandhi, Portugal, etc. ...

Since the Maoists have been more successful than the Soviets in attracting young U.S. radicals, the NCLC may simply be the best resource at hand to counter the Moaist influence. While I cannot visualize a force as sophisticated as the KGB taking the NCLC positions seriously, the KGB must be aware of its potential for violence and assassination. Conceivably it is directing some money into the operation. Clearly NCLC founder

Lyndon LaRouche's trip to Iraq this spring was an attempt to secure funding...

The NCLC is experiencing serious economic difficulties...

There appear to be two reasons for these problems. One is that the NCLC is encountering substantial legal obligations as a result of many arrests of its members and various other legal actions including the law suit filed by the UAW. Secondly, anticipated growth has not occurred...

The NCLC must be watched closely to see whether it becomes an overtly terrorist organization. I am personally uncomfortable about the incredible charges hurled against Nelson Rockefeller and, to a lesser extent, Leonard Woodcock and George Meany. All three are pictured as prime movers of conspiracy to control the world and, incidentally, maim and rape NCLC Members...

If as I expect, the NCLC's financial troubles increase, it has the potential for resorting to bank robberies, etc., as has the Symbionese Liberation Army, but there is no evidence that it has done so.

A number of strategically-placed NCLC watchers share my concern over its potential for evolving into a terrorist gang. If it does, it will be following the same path used by Students for a Democratic Society in spawning the Weatherman Faction. However, at the peak of their terrorist activity, the Weatherman probably had no more than 75 hard core members.

If — a big if — If the NCLC does evolve into an armed, terrorist group, it will be substantially larger than the

Weathermen and the leadership considerably more resourceful.

The Anti-Defamation League has produced a fact sheet on the NCLC, paralleling the HOMEFRONT report of April, '75, but is not carrying out an in-depth observation.

While parents of NCLC members do trade information, and an organization of parents is possible, they do not appear likely to sustain a serious monitoring operation.

There are a number of questions which need answering:

The material is at hand for an in-depth report, but should it be such that it can be shared with the news media and others in a position to do something about this phenomenon?

Should my monitoring continue?

Should we promote more local countervailing activity? (It is my judgment that frustrating local efforts helps burn off the energies of both the members and the organization and thus helps reduce its potential.)

(deleted) should we make our information available to that body and seek its involvement, perfectly legitimate, in tracing the unreported resources of the U.S. Labor Party and the unreported expenditures made on behalf of its state and national candidates?

(Deleted)

In short, I think a meeting of those most concerned with this phenomenon to review what is known and to decide what should be done about it would be most helpful, and it seems to me that a good time for such a meeting is NOW.

FEC Plays Nasty Games With USLP Candidates

Federal Elections Commission Chairman Thomas Harris and his associates are launching legal actions against a number of Labor Party candidates.

Last week, the FEC filed a civil suit in U.S. District Court in Baltimore against William Salisbury, a party congressional candidate in 1976. The Commission claims that Salisbury failed to file a report required by the FEC, and it now demands he be fined \$5,000. However, in earlier correspondence, the FEC accepted Salisbury's statement that the report had been filed and agreed that if he would file a second copy, it would drop the matter. Is it possible Commissioner Harris has not informed his underlings of his own intentions towards the Labor Party?

Two other actions would seem to indicate this

may be the case. The FEC also recently filed suit against Anthony Curry, who ran for Congress in 1976 in Cleveland. Again, Commission employees agreed to accept a refiling of the campaign report they claimed to be missing. Now the FEC wants Curry to sign a consent decree admitting "guilt" and to pay \$100 in fines.

Enforcement proceedings are also being threatened against U.S. Labor Party 1976 Vice Presidential candidate Wayne Evans. The Evans case follows exactly the same pattern: the Commission has apparently voted to disregard the agreement made by its attorneys and insist Evans sign a consent decree and pay \$100.

Both Curry and Evans have rejected the FEC's proposed "settlement" of their cases, noting that the FEC has *never* fined any candidate who agreed to cooperate with their reporting procedures.