

deviation of the Moro investigations away from the cited direction to one of the Christian Democrats' motivations during the kidnapping period. The battered DC government of Premier Andreotti has as a result been put under enormous pressure.

An 'ideological' attack

An even more significant aspect of the "Phase II" attack on Italy, however, is centering on the PCI. Socialist Party secretary Bettino Craxi is also engaged in spearheading an "ideological" attack against the Communists geared to disrupting the latter's alliance with the Christian Democrats — an alliance without which the minority DC government would immediately collapse.

Craxi and older "historic" leaders of the party such as Riccardo Lombardi (of thorough British political pedigree) have initiated a campaign against the PCI-DC "historic compromise" profiled on the Communists' predictable Achilles heel: that close collaboration with the DC "capitalists" blatantly contradicts the PCI's communist ideology.

What the PSI is proposing is two-fold: that the PCI break with the DC (and incidentally collapse the government) and simultaneously break with the Soviet Union in order to then form an appropriate alliance with the Socialists capable of giving the country a "left alternative" to the DC's 30-year rule.

The most recently authoritative response to this tactic was issued on Sept. 15 by PCI secretary Enrico

Berlinguer in his Genoa speech to a crowd of hundreds of thousands. The exclusive subject of the speech was a hard-line response to Craxi and the Socialists, with an included defense of the DC-PCI "historic compromise." Said Berlinguer, "There is today an offensive, denigratory and confusionary attack being launched against the PCI. . . . Their objective is to weaken the PCI, slandering it and its strategy and thereby trying to force it to go backward in its policies (i.e., break the historic compromise —ed.). This objective, no matter how it is masked, if it were reached would provoke only one result: pushing the political climate toward the right." Berlinguer characterized the campaign as one of positing "ideological ultimata," an unmistakable allusion to Craxi and the PSI.

Although, as the speech indicates, Berlinguer is not yet backing down to the Socialist profiled assault, nonetheless the almost "Stalinist" (to quote *Repubblica*) "hard-line" nature of his defensive speech has already begun to initiate strains in PCI-DC relations. Such a process, if allowed to continue, would certainly collapse the government in time. The only sure counterattack to "Phase II" is thus to proceed rapidly with what the operation was launched to prevent in the first place: exposing the international Zionist-British networks responsible for the Moro murder and other terrorism.

—Vivian Zoakos

Business Week caught 'in flagrante delicto'

"In flagrante delicto" was the phrase one influential New York figure used this past week, in the course of remarking on *Business Week's* open collaboration with a notorious proterrorist, Harvey Kahn.

The remarks were volunteered by a discussion of a three-page, illustrated lead article appearing in the "Economics" section of the magazine's Oct. 2 issue. The article, "The U.S. Labor Party's Radical Crusade," was prepared largely in collaboration with Harvey Kahn, a point emphasized by Kahn himself. Kahn's remarks to that effect, made in advance of the article's publication, accurately forecast the line which appeared in the published version.

Later during the same week, Kahn was a featured speaker at a Michigan conference of Morton Halperin's Committee to Stop Government Spying. The two principal items of the conference's agenda

were the Halperin group's attacks on the U.S. Labor Party and the prestigious national police-intelligence organization, the LIEU. Kahn presented the Halperin group's line on the Labor Party, using the line featured in the *Business Week* article as the basis for proposed disruptive actions against the Party.

The character of that conference is underlined by the side-show events. These included Afeni Shakur of the "Black Liberation Army" (BLA), and Attorney William Kunstler's current defense of Baader-Meinhof terrorist Kristina Berster.

Business Week has, indeed, placed itself in most unsavory company.

Labor Party Reaction

"Shocking, but not properly astonishing," remarked Labor Party Chairman Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

"The longer I live, the more I realize how much everything that happens is ultimately lawful.

"Bill Wollman (*Business Week* Economics Editor William Wollman) has jumped into bed with the economic policies of the British-Canadian gang that control terrorism. You open the sheets and you find Wollman's department cohabiting with a known terrorist.

"I grant that that imagery is slightly misleading. Bill Wollman is by no means as ingenuous as that might suggest. We don't know where the ownership of McGraw-Hill stands on this as of yet, but we know that a high-level, major policy-decision was made before *Business Week* accepted the risk of implicating itself in this nasty bit of business.

"For the sake of some of the more stubbornly simple-minded folks, I think we ought to prove even to their satisfaction exactly what the nature of that policy decision was.

"First, take the basic facts about the article. It is a lead item, and is run in the 'Economics' section, rather than in the odd corner of the magazine, where they'd normally stick the 'oddities and sidelights' sort of nonsense the content of the article itself would ordinarily prescribe. The fact that a decision was made to feature such an article in that location already tells us a few basic facts.

"When that much money and effort, that much importance is given to arguing that a topic is unimportant in character, a certain aroma is established. Placing the article as a lead-item in the 'Economics' section is the crucial indicator so far in stating the case.

"The next key fact is the failure of the writer's editors to conceal the coordination of the article with Harvey Kahn. Remember, the editors know who and what Harvey Kahn represents. Years past, *Business Week* wouldn't allow that character to be detected any closer to their offices than the pimp's side of Eighth Avenue on 42nd Street. Remember, at the very time that corporate officers and corporate security offices are digging in for a threatened wave of terrorism, *Business Week* presents itself in corporate offices, shamelessly advertising its own cohabitation with one of the most notorious second-stringers among leading terrorist supporters in the United States.

"Granted, Jack Anderson does that sort of thing regularly. The latest Vesco hoax against President Carter is a typical piece of Anderson's 'investigative journalist' ethics. His slander-piece on us was actually

put together by known terrorist supporters. Anderson has enough muscle from international intelligence connections to get by — so far — with the kind of filthy operation he runs. *Business Week* is not Anderson. Everyone on the corporate level knows that Anderson is a sewer. What Anderson gets by with regularly would really hurt McGraw-Hill's credibility in a serious way. *Business Week's* being used openly by a known terrorist supporter like Kahn is something that just doesn't happen unless there's a major policy reason for violating every standard they've maintained over years.

"Someone made a decision to trade-off vital intangible business assets of McGraw-Hill for what they considered a higher interest. McGraw-Hill's going to be hurt by this dirty little business. Under loose New York judicial standards for libel, probably they can squeak by with the slanderous character of the piece, but they have really hurt their credibility in the corporate boardroom. The law department, or anyone else involved in clearing the publication, would have seen that point immediately. There was clearly an overriding consideration.

"We know what the basis for defining a higher interest was. Bill Wollman's lining up openly against the EMF makes that plain enough. There is not much middle ground on the EMF issue around New York City these days. A few hold-outs are still privately pro-EMF, but most of the boys are behaving like a horde of hysterical lemmings running for the cliffs. Most are lined up with the British and the Canadians; they're hysterical about their determination to stick with the British and attempt to wreck the EMF. Obviously, *Business Week* has joined the pack of lunatics on this turn.

"In this kind of a fight, if you crawl into bed with Bronfman, Montefiore, Rupert Murdoch, Lazard, Rothschild and the rest of that crowd, you buy that crowd's whole package. You put up with their international illegal-drug traffic, you play along with their control of organized crime, you don't ask questions about who really ordered the killing of President Kennedy, and you tolerate their scummy environmentalist and terrorist operations.

"All the same, if some public figure in the USA does become kidnapped by terrorists, or is blown up by a terrorist bomb, his friends and family are going to remember what sort of bedfellows Bill Wollman has been cohabiting with.'