

American Progress, 'Right to Know' At Stake In UAW Case Against New Solidarity

On April 7, 1977, Judge Lawrence Pierce of New York's Southern District Federal Court will convene trial proceedings in the case of the United Auto Workers and Leonard Woodcock vs. the National Caucus of Labor Committees, the U.S. Labor Party, Lyndon LaRouche and *Campaigner* Publications. By that time, the defendant U.S. Labor Party et al. will have incurred at least \$60,000 in legal expenses, the apparent minimum injury the UAW hopes to inflict on its most prominent political opponents.

The plaintiff UAW leadership charges the Labor Party with trademark infringement and libel. The contention of the defendants is that Leonard Woodcock, a member of David Rockefeller's Trilateral Commission, is acting for that commission and the incoming Carter Administration composed largely of Trilateral members and affiliates to destroy the Labor Party and the NCLC.

The constitutional issue posed by this UAW suit to shut down all U.S. Labor Party publications is in itself extraordinary, and without precedent in the United States' 200 years as a republic. When the fundamental differences in political program separating the court adversaries are also considered, the coming trial looms as of major international significance, with direct bearing on the world's economic and political future. Will the court uphold industrial progress or zero-growth economics as the mandate of the U.S. Constitution?

The Labor Party has, throughout its history, been the most vigorous advocate of policies of industrial and agricultural expansion and of programs designed to reassert the industrial, scientific, and technological leadership of the United States. This advocacy has included press exposure and informational campaigns against advocates of zero growth, deindustrialization and associated corporatist police-state forms of society, Leonard Woodcock prominent among them. The UAW's legal attack on the Labor Party therefore goes to the heart of the First Amendment: the public's "right to know" as a fundamental condition for the maintenance and development of human progress.

The suit itself was filed in November 1974 by the UAW, which contends that the editors and publishers of *New Solidarity*, the newspaper of the U.S. Labor Party, are guilty of trademark infringement and unfair competition against the United Auto Workers' in-house publication, *UAW Solidarity*. That the UAW leadership obtained a trademark on the word "Solidarity" only after filing a

suit against their most vociferous political opponents is the first of several glaring anomalies surrounding the UAW action. Not only does the UAW ask the extraordinary sum of \$35,000,000 in damages, but requests that the court compel the defendants to "deliver up for destruction by plaintiff UAW all past issues of *New Solidarity* and all promotional material, documents, etc. which contain the name *New Solidarity*."

On the face of the matter, the UAW leaders have proceeded as a large corporation against a smaller competitor, intending not only to bankrupt its opponent, but to eliminate every one of the Labor Party's varied political and economic publications down to the last single copy.

The UAW complaint itself has revealed the political motivation behind the case. The complaint charges the defendant organizations with libeling and defaming UAW President Woodcock and other union officials, principally by the use of the word "fascist" to describe their policies and programs.

The defendants unsuccessfully filed a motion for summary judgment and dismissal in March 1975, arguing that the UAW had known of the existence of their *New Solidarity* newspaper since 1971 and were therefore guilty of extraordinary and unjustifiable delay. The USLP et al. also argued that "Solidarity" had been frequently used in the title of many other publications in the U.S., and that the two papers bore no similarity in lay-out, format, content or demographic distribution. Leonard Woodcock and other UAW leaders are "public figures," the defendants contended, and their description of Woodcock's policies and programs were demonstrably factual, in the use of the term "fascist" in particular.

The UAW's part in the broader, Trilateral Commission campaign against the *New Solidarity* publishers was identified in separate counterclaims filed by the defendants. Cases of USLP members, supporters and sympathizers being fired, fined, harassed, threatened, subjected to behavior modification treatments, or assaulted by UAW officials — UAW officials have been convicted 11 times in such assaults — were documented in the defendants' brief.

The UAW, which has retained the firm of Cowan, Liebowitz and Latman, specialists in trademark law, has submitted discovery motions arguing that the *New Solidarity* publication has damaged their relations with the government and the Congress, and crippled their

ability to succeed in their legislative efforts.

The Labor Party does not deny that its purpose is to prevent the passage of all "zero-growth" legislation, including that supported or authored by the UAW. The party contends that the implied connection between the freedom of the press and the successful development of industry is the real issue of the case. For a precedent, one must return to the famous 1735 case of John Peter Zenger, according to the most recent treatment accorded the UAW case in the defendants' *New Solidarity* (Vol. VII, No. 85, Jan. 4, 1977). Zenger was acquitted of libel involving the colonial Governor of New York, because his damaging descriptions and allegations against the governor's activities were found to be true, writes Nancy Spannaus, the U.S. Labor Party's Director of Publications and *New Solidarity's* Editor-In-Chief. Moreover, she argues, the corruptions laid at the door of the colonial governor involved steps consistent with the prevailing "monetarist" policy of the British monarchy to impose "no growth" policies on the developing trade and manufacture of the American colonies.

"Shall Leonard Woodcock be granted the privileges which even the King's representative could not use to suppress organizing against his arbitrary actions and economic looting more than 200 years ago?" Spannaus asks.

The USLP asserts it is no coincidence that one of Leonard Woodcock's principal international associates, Willy Brandt, Chairman of the West German Social Democratic Party, has also undertaken legal actions against *New Solidarity's* sister publication in West Germany, *Neue Solidarität*. Using a statute instituted under Adolf Hitler, Brandt has carried out several successful prosecutions of the *Neue Solidarität* editors for damaging his career of association with the CIA, Rockefeller family and Trilateral Commission by "the spreading of facts" — the clause that the Zenger case threw off the statute books of colonial America.

Leonard Woodcock is well known as an advocate of

policies of make-work and forced work employment intentionally unrelated to the industrial and agricultural production needs of the U.S. economy and people. The Labor Party has characterized these as "slave labor" programs, "modeled" on those of Adolf Hitler. Woodcock is consistent in advocating industrial contraction in the American midwest, with one "exception that proves the rule:" he is in favor of converting idle auto facilities to tank production. This is another example of Third Reich precedents emphasized by the Labor Party, which has published detailed programs for converting the same auto facilities to tractor production in the journals Woodcock seeks to close down. Woodcock has firmly supported the Trilateral Commission's program for "reduction of population" in the developing sector nations and an early military confrontation with the USSR, which is inalterably opposed to that policy because of the broad extension of NATO and related U.S. military-policing power it would necessarily require. Woodcock himself is part of policymaking circles who have publicly characterized their program, in *Challenge* magazine, as "fascism with a human face."

The USLP contends that these policies are virtually identical with the commitments of the incoming Carter Administration. Woodcock was one of Carter's earliest public backers among trade unionists and supported his candidacy through such dubious devices as "Operation Big Vote," widely believed to have been a vehicle for vote fraud. After Nov. 2, Woodcock's name was repeatedly and prominently mentioned as a candidate for a post in the Carter Administration. These developments have prompted the Labor Party to charge that Woodcock's effort to destroy it on the pretext of trademark minutiae is an action taken in "surrogate" for the Carter Administration itself, which otherwise will benefit most by the elimination of its most respected pro-development opponents, but is constitutionally forbidden (re: Zenger) to undertake action to the same ends in the name of government.