

NEWS ANALYSIS

Why Rocky Ordered Atrocity Against LALC

NEW YORK, March 29 — Current press reports in leading Mexico City newspapers corroborate the Labor Committees' assessment of the CIA-directed and supervised abduction of local Labor Committee leaders by the secret police there.

El Dia, the official organ of the ruling Mexican party, the PRI, carried a column by Jose Luis Gonzalez which denounces Willy Brandt and the Social Democracy in its March 29th edition. Meanwhile, a satirical column carried on the same day by El Universal, a right-liberal journal, points directly to the Labor Committee abduction as part of a "destabilization" operation. A third column in Excelsior cryptically outlines the "destabilization" script: "It is being said that the regime purposefully allowing denunciations on corruption to flower," sowing the necessary chaos and confusion, "all of which must be carried out before the probable candidate who will take in his hands the reins of the next six-year period is uncovered."

Mooting a major change in leadership, Echeverria spokesman, Enrique Ramirez, the director of El Dia, stated on March 27th that "If by some grave accident of our history some government like that of President Echeverria were overthrown there is no possibility that it could be succeeded by a more revolutionary and advanced government than the present one." In a highly unusual meeting, one day before Echeverria's provocation-visit to the National University, Echeverria met with the heads of all 35 military zones in the country and fifteen high military commanders. The subject of this high-powered meeting was not disclosed.

At the same time, Mexican sources privately and independently reported to us the identical information leaked to us earlier by an informed diplomatic source: Echeverria is now considered a confirmed shoo-in to replace present U.N. secretary-general Kurt Waldheim at an early date.

The El Dia attack on Brandt, taken in the context of other Mexico City press coverage, means that the Rockefeller-ordered "destabilization" tactic is an open secret throughout informed Mexican political and press circles. The rage

against Brandt by El Dia reflects the fact that it was U.S. agent Brandt and his police-studded entourage which delivered the detailed orders to Echeverria and the Mexican Interior Ministry for the abduction of de Hoyos and Mendez. Echeverria and Company are obediently carrying out the Brandt-conducted order, but with intense hatred against those who delivered Rockefeller's orders for this operation.

Also indicative is an official statement issued by a Mexican consular official in Italy, that the Labor Committee is being "manipulated by the CIA." The facts behind that shocking slander are as follows

How the Set-up Was Made

As previously reported, the March provocation at the Autonomous University of Mexico was a carefully prepared operation. It was preceded by a massive atrocity by heavily-armed and masked "porros" at the University of Guerrero a few days earlier.

Both the Mexican Labor Committees and the leadership of the Communist Party of Mexico immediately and independently recognized the nature of the provocation, and took direct action by appeal to the students, warning against any "student protest" activity during President Echeverria's scheduled speaking presence on that campus. Despite Labor Committee and Communist Party warnings, various left countergang groups, including the FPI ("NewLeft" anarchists) and GCI ("Trotskyists") joined with and officially supported the goals of the provocateurs who initiated incidents which occurred.

Immediately following this incident, the Mexico City press slandered both the Labor Committees and the Communist Party with charges that these organizations were principal instigators of the campus violence. Under heavy government pressure, the Mexican press initially refused to accept even paid advertisements by the Labor Committee, Communist Party and other exposing that lie.

At that point it was clear that both the Labor Committees and Communist Party were officially set up for secret police

atrocities. Until forty-eight hours after the abduction of de Hoyos and Mendez, it was still an open question whether leading Communist members would also be abducted.

Retrospectively, now that it is known that this atrocity of the Mexican secret police is a Brandt-ordered, CIA-directed "destabilization" tactic, the reason for the CIA's selection of the Labor Committees and not the Communist Party as the victim becomes clear.

The essence of the use of a CIA-directed atrocity to "destabilize" a government is the presumption that the friends of the victim will create an effective furore in effort to rescue their comrades. When the past performance of the Labor Committees and Communist parties are compared, the reason for the CIA's selection of the Labor Committee victims is obvious.

A comparison of two recent cases from Mexican experience would be sufficient. First, the effective mobilization which the Labor Committees organized in North America and Western Europe during the first abduction of de Hoyos, during his fifty-nine hour incarceration by the secret police beginning Dec. 11, 1974.

Second, the secret police assassination of abducted leading Communist Party member Professor Hilario Moreno, which broke into public knowledge on January 5. In connection with this affair, the Labor Committees actions in defense of the Communist Party of Mexico in the USA and Western Europe was immediate and far more vigorous and extensive than the total actions by Communist parties' newspapers and organizations.

It is a fair statement of the evidence in hand that the CIA could direct a total assassination of the Communist Party in Mexico and that there would be very little effective public protest activity by leading Communist publications in North America and Western Europe. The faint-hearted, cringing public statement of the Mexican Communist Party leadership issued in Excelsior following the de Hoyos and Mendez abduction is a fair representation of official Communist policy on such matters. On performance to date — out of fear of offending "third World leader"

Echeverria — the Soviet Union, most of the parties of Eastern Europe, including Yugoslavia, and key Communist parties in the capitalist sector would probably bow to protocol and politely swallow their anger at the butchery of their comrades.

It is to be emphasized in this connection that the Soviet leadership, in particular, has a potentially fatal fascination with protocol and "proper channels" which renders them frequently incapable of reacting to even decisive issues of Soviet self-interest.

One could sum up the point in the form of a hypothetical question: "If you were Rockefeller's CIA, and you wished to create an atrocity whose outcome would contribute directly to discrediting of the Echeverria regime, which victim — the Labor Committee or the Mexican Communist Party — would you select for your "destabilizing" atrocity?"

Portugal Case

If there were any questions on this point among top CIA circles, their recent experience with our response to the AP and N.Y. Times launching of Rockefeller's Portugal atrocity campaign would leave them in no doubt of the effective impact of our reaction to any criminal Brandt-ordered atrocities against our members. Here, again, although the courageous Portuguese Communist Party and some of its friends did respond competently to the onset of the attack, it was the Labor Committees, and only a few other Communist parties, which did the most effective publicity work outside Portugal in defense of the Portuguese workers' movement at that juncture.

For example, according to PCI delegates, it was only the Labor Committees' intervention into the PCI Congress which created sufficient pressure there to force Amendola and Berlinguer to permit the PCP delegate to take the microphone to rebut slanders made against his party by PCI leaders themselves!

CIA Policies

Toward Labor Committees

U.S. "intelligence community" circles have manifestly treated the Labor Committees as an extraordinary potential menace to Rockefeller et al. since the April-May, 1968 Columbia strike. Well aware that the Columbia strike had been conceived and initiated by the then-small Labor Committees, RAND Corporation and other Rockefeller "intelligence community" agencies conducted three distinct and costly oper-

ations against us through the Ford Foundation. Mark Rudd's subsequent political career was launched through a Ford-associated CIA conduit as one of those three operations. A year later, in follow-up of public warning against the Labor Committee menace by Rockefeller henchman C. Richardson Dilworth, a series of operations, including a subsequently exposed police frame-up, were launched against the Labor Committee in Philadelphia.

After mid-August, 1971, this activity was stepped up, using "left-cover" police-controlled organizations and agents in an effort to contain our growing influence among the "left" generally. This was in response to the unique and electrifying vindication of our long-standing conjunctural perspectives by the mid-August collapse of the Bretton-Woods agreements.

The forces included were police-controlled organizations such as the SWP and police agents within the Communist Party itself, such as "labor columnist" George Morris. (Morris originated the "CIA" slander in October, 1971, on behalf of now self-exposed Rockefeller agent, David Livingston of Woodcock's professedly fascist ICNEP.) It is notable in this connection that prior to August, 1971, the attacks and even the slanders directed against the Labor Committees were of the form of "factional" denunciations characteristic of the left throughout the world generally up to that time. However, since August, 1971, the slanders by all groups have conformed clinically to the political police mentality rather than those patterns intrinsic to the mental outlook of the actual socialist.

The Rockefeller-CIA's fearful respect for the Labor Committees has multiplied in three phases since the beginning of the police-directed attacks. The first of these three escalations came in response to our spread into Western Europe, from 1970 onwards. The second came in response to our discovery and exposure of the "destabilization" of the U.S. government through the Nixon impeachment tactic. The third escalation occurred in response to the combined effect of our strategic analysis of last October and our concurrent effective intervention into the Mideast situation.

This present fear of our growing influence by the Rockefeller-CIA forces is reflected in two main ways. In North

America, desperate efforts at containment of the Labor Committees and Labor Party takes the form of a massive concentration of CIA-directed press slanders and FBI assaults. Not since the Palmer raids of the early 1920's — out of which the FBI was created — has a U.S. socialist organization been subjected to more massive expenditures of police harassment per member than are the Labor Parties in the U.S. and Canada today. In Western Europe, the CIA's effort is concentrated on "dirty tricks" attempting to sabotage all collaboration between us and both mass-based Communist parties and social-democratic left-wing forces.

The key to all CIA-directed anti-Labor Committee deployments is the word "containment." On the strategic scale of operations, Rockefeller's minions are aiming to prevent the outcome they fear, the hitching of the Labor Committee's intellectual qualities of leadership to the mass-based force of existing workers' organizations.

This applies to the attempted CIA Mexican manipulation of the Labor Committees in the following exact terms. Provided the key Communist parties keep their distance from the Labor Committees during this period, the Labor Committees outside the U.S. are reduced to a very effective head without a substantial body. The capacity of the Labor Committee to penalize Echeverria for his criminal complicity with his CIA masters is still enormous without collaboration of mass-based forces in Europe; however, as the Communist parties run for cover — out of fear and consideration of protocol — by virtue of such Communist Party stupidity, Rockefeller and Brandt are able to deflect our efforts to the effect of scapegoating Echeverria's regime, rather than incurring the brunt of our counter-attack on themselves.

Willy Brandt himself emphasized his awareness of that point. Speaking in Washington, D.C. on March 27, he gloated: the "Communist virus" is, in his stated opinion, a "very weak strain," and thus not to be feared. On the basis of recent CP performance, Brandt's observation is not without basis in fact.

However, Brandt grossly underestimates the willingness of the Soviet leadership to be pushed absolutely to the wall. The danger of thermonuclear war is far greater than Rockefeller's reckless minions stupidly imagine to be the case.