

come forward, against those in particular who have dared to contribute financially to this movement.

We single out here for attention the case of Lewis du Pont Smith, who, solely because of his political beliefs, has been declared mentally incompetent by two courts of law in this land. Mr. Smith and his wife Andrea have presented to us a most convincing case, not just of his mental competence, but of the use of unprecedented, Soviet-style psychological warfare against a political dissident in this nation.

Looking for the cause of this wave of terror, we are directed by the testimony of two of the world's leading experts in Soviet techniques of warfare: Paul-Albert Scherer of the Federal Republic of Germany, and Ralph de Toledano, the respected American journalist and author.

Retired Brigadier General Scherer is the former commanding officer of one of the world's most successful counterintelligence services, the military intelligence division of the Bundeswehr. In his testimony, he states, "I have declared my readiness to testify before the independent committee to investigate the LaRouche case, because I am convinced that Mr. LaRouche is neither a faker, nor an agent of influence, and certainly not a neo-Nazi or fascist. . . ." He points, as an intelligence expert, to the offensive against LaRouche, as "a typical, offensive, and manipulative intelligence-directed operation, aimed at eliminating an opinion-shaper, who is a considerable disruption to the Kremlin's policies, and who can neither be silenced nor influenced by means of the usual financial arrangements."

Mr. Ralph de Toledano, perhaps better known to the American press, presented similar evidence to us, from his personal interview with Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche, and a fact-finding tour he undertook for the Commission. In his statement, presented to us last Wednesday, Mr. de Toledano stated, "Whatever the substantive issues of [the LaRouche] case—and they are small—it can be stated categorically that the Justice Department has made a mockery of the First, Fourth, and Fifth Amendments specifically and of the Constitution as a whole in its prosecutorial attempt to silence and suppress the LaRouche movement. Both the Justice Department and its investigative agencies have acted more like the Gestapo or KGB in their utter disregard of law, hounding the defendants, illegally seizing property, and negating the safeguards of the accused as written into the Constitution and our common law."

We find ourselves in full agreement with the assessment of these two experts.

As a body of attorneys under sanction of the Commission, we are not constituted with force of law, and thus are not in a position to present an indictment for wrongdoing in this affair. We are, however, in a position to bring the force of moral suasion and public opinion to bear, through the efforts of the Commission, to right the wrongs which have been committed against Mr. LaRouche and his associates. This we intend to do.

Ralph de Toledano

Who really is Lyndon LaRouche?

What follows is a transcript of the testimony delivered to the Fact-Finding Committee in Arlington, Virginia on Sept. 9. Subheads have been added by the editors.

My name is Ralph de Toledano. I live and work in Washington, D.C. (I guess for my sins) as a nationally syndicated columnist for Copley News Service, a contributing editor of *National Review*, and a free-lance writer and political analyst. I am the author of 19 books on such topics as Soviet espionage and Soviet penetration of the United States government, biographies of important political figures—Richard Nixon, Robert F. Kennedy, and J. Edgar Hoover among them—and perhaps also for my sins, two novels and a book of verse. I was the first newspaperman to interview Igor Gouzenko, the Soviet cipher clerk whose defection led to the arrest and conviction of numerous atomic spies. More recently, I broke the story of the defection to the CIA of Vitaly Yurchenko, the high-ranking KGB official and of the mysterious disappearance of Vladimir Alexandrov, the scientist who did the mathematical calculations for the "nuclear winter" hoax.

During the many years I have worked as a journalist, I have had the confidence of four Presidents—the late Herbert Hoover, who referred to me (perhaps mistakenly) as "one of the most astute political analysts in this country"; Richard M. Nixon, who was a friend until some of the people around Bob Haldeman terminated that friendship; Gerald Ford, for whom I helped prepare a report on American military strength and strategy during his congressional days; and Ronald Reagan.

I have known Mr. Reagan for many years, and I like to tell a story about him, when he was governor of California, and I went to visit him in Sacramento. I walked into his office and he said, "Hi, Ralph," and I said, "Hi, Ron," and I said, "How are things going?" He said, "Oh, the same as usual—

they still stick the knives in the same places!"

I have traveled widely in Europe, Asia, and Africa—visiting the Soviet Union on three occasions, one of them being the coverage of the 1972 summit. Throughout my professional life, I have had numerous contacts and associations in the Congress and federal government.

I say these things not to pat myself on the back, but perhaps to lend credence to what I am about to say. It is this background which conditions this testimony on Lyndon LaRouche and the political movement which he leads. Let me state first that I am not in any way connected with Mr. LaRouche or that movement. I have frequently disagreed with the positions taken by him and by his associates, though for the most part I agree in general with his analysis of the dangers to this Republic of Russian imperialism and Soviet adventurism. I agree with him that Marxism is merely one outward manifestation of the Nechaevism and the Russian mystique which threaten the free world.

Lyndon LaRouche and his followers have been attacked as agents of the KGB, as "Nazis without swastikas," as anti-Semites, and as "radicals." The last charge, interestingly, comes from liberals whose admiration for "radicalism" when it is of the Leninist variety, knows few bounds. The charge that Mr. LaRouche is an agent of the KGB and financed by Moscow gold has been given wide publicity in such august publications as the *New York Times*. It has been contradicted passionately by the Soviet press and by Moscow's one-time friend, the Anti-Defamation League. The charge of "anti-Semitism" is in no conflict with either of the above since hatred of the Jews and of Israel is endemic to both fascism and communism.

Let me note first, that I became more than casually interested in the LaRouche movement when the Democratic Party, in an hysterical fit, sought to subvert the will of Illinois voters by attempting to remove from the ballot two candidates for state office, members of the LaRouche movement, who had legitimately and legally won their candidacies in the state primary.

That to me was not particularly surprising. As a lifelong Republican, I expect very little concern for civil rights in the Democratic Party. The fact that there was no outcry from those people who spend their time on civil rights and human rights, was shocking to me, and I wrote about it in a column which won me the hatred of people who I considered fellow conservatives and anti-communists, because I had the nerve and temerity to state that Lyndon LaRouche and his followers were entitled to civil rights in the United States.

I was jolted again by the attack on Lyndon LaRouche and his movement by the Justice Department in a case that will come to trial soon in Boston. Whatever the substantive issues of that case—and they are small—it can be stated categorically that the Justice Department has made a mockery of the First, Fourth, and Fifth Amendments specifically, and of the Constitution as a whole, in its prosecutorial attempt to silence

and suppress the LaRouche movement. Both the Justice Department and its investigative agencies have acted more like the Gestapo or KGB in their utter disregard of law, hounding the defendants, illegally seizing property, and negating the safeguards to the accused as written into the Constitution and our common law.

As a newspaperman, I was particularly shocked at the suppression of newspapers and other publications, a suppression so violent, that I cannot think of a single instance in U.S. history that has been so blatant.

Others, I am sure, will develop this denial of fundamental civil and human rights to Mr. LaRouche and his movement, but I am moved to point out that only one small Washington publication in the last few days, a paper called the *City Paper*, has seen fit to expose the Justice Department and its political motivation in what should now be a cause célèbre.

The view in Europe

In search of the truth about Lyndon LaRouche and his movement, I journeyed to Wiesbaden two weeks ago and spent some six hours listening to Mr. LaRouche expound his views. I might add that my wife was with me and afterwards she said, "That was the longest time I've ever seen you with your mouth shut!" But frankly, I was not there to hold forth. I was there to listen to what Mr. LaRouche had to say.

As something of an expert on totalitarianism, I listened closely for even a hint of Nazism or Marxism-Leninism in what he had to say. I was amused at the start to discover that Lyndon LaRouche is as far from the booted stormtrooper of journalistic myth as he could possibly be. A vigorous speaker, yes, but almost professorial in his approach. He struck me as a man of broad, though from my viewpoint, not perfect vision who had studied in depth the sources of those values which we call democratic.

Let me repeat: I have a good nose for totalitarianism. I have fought Nazis, fascists, communists for most of my life, and they have fought me, and they have threatened me, and there have been times when I thought that my life wasn't worth very much. I recognize them. And in listening to Mr. LaRouche, I saw none of this. I heard none of this, what I heard was reasoned analysis of what besets our society, of what besets the Western world and our civilization.

I think Mr. LaRouche was best summed up by Marie-Madeleine Fourcade in her deposition to this Commission. Mme. Fourcade, as you know, was one of the leaders of the French Resistance during World War II, an intelligence specialist with the Free French fighting forces, and latterly a member of the European Parliament. She met Mr. LaRouche long before President Reagan had proposed the Strategic Defense Initiative and was struck by his proposal of a "space shield" to defend the United States and Europe from Soviet nuclear missiles.

At the time, and to this day, Mr. LaRouche seemed to Mme. Fourcade to be, "above all . . . a serious man, resolute

and not taking account of established prejudices in making effective an idea which he judged—rightly—to be fundamental for the security of the Western democracies against the nuclear armaments of their adversaries.

“However, it was on another count that M. LaRouche earned my esteem. . . . I thus fully endorse his battle against hunger and malthusianism, and it is with great interest that I have taken note of his proposals for a new world economic order founded on mutual development, and for a new Marshall Plan, an initiative in which my own government, the French government, would participate.

“M. LaRouche, in the course of numerous meetings I have had with him, seemed to me not only a leader raising the fundamental problems of his day, but also like a man of heart, immediately moved to seek solutions to these problems and to fight for those solutions with great courage.

“A direct man, M. LaRouche has never been afraid to say what he thinks, and to make it known loud and strong. At the same time, I have always esteemed his concern not to gratuitously attack the powers that be, but on the contrary always to try to convince them.”

And, Mme. Fourcade added, “I have particularly appreciated the human quality and the devotion to the cause of freedom shown by M. LaRouche’s associates whom I have had occasion to come to know. These men and women struggle while living materially with very little, and show a constant devotion to the cause of Europe and the West, to the cause of liberty and justice.”

And this last statement I can underscore, because in the last weeks and months, I have come to know a number of people associated with LaRouche and I have been struck by their dedication and their sense that they had something to contribute, whether or not they prospered in doing so.

I quote Mme. Fourcade at such length, because she expressed the same sentiments to me when I visited her in Paris last week. Mme. Fourcade is a woman to be respected, She is 78 years old, and I wish at my age I had half the drive and the energy that she has. She is still active in the politics of France—which can sap anybody’s energy—and a woman of tremendous personality and character. She has fought the battle, the battle that many of us have tried to fight, physically fought it—not merely talked about it. My respect was reinforced when I discovered that people in France—leaders, members of the National Assembly, fighters for freedom, fighters for justice both in their country and the world, people I have respected and known—were associated with her. People like the late Marcel de Camray, and Gen. Pierre du Ben-ville, who fought for the Free French from England and returned to France to fight against fascism and communism and for democracy.

As I have said, one need not agree with Lyndon LaRouche, and one may also take exception to some of his unbridled rhetoric. When he speaks or writes, he may sometimes overstate his case. He may be in error, but that does

not make him a fascist, a communist, a tool of the neo-Nazis or the KGB. Most of all, it does not make him the assassin who ended the life of Olof Palme in Sweden—as the Soviet press and the KGB disinformation apparatus and their worldwide allies have charged. It will be interesting to see if the French courts, who have been hearing Mr. LaRouche’s libel action against *New Times*, an international Soviet propaganda organ, have the courage to rule against Moscow.

But whether they rule against Moscow in this libel action, it is one of tremendous significance, because Mr. LaRouche and his friends and allies in France have put the Soviet Union on the defensive. And if they win, we can expect hundreds, if not thousands, of libel actions against Soviet publications which have over the years destroyed reputations, falsified history, and have done (to use an expression Mr. LaRouche likes) “the work of Satan.”

And in Israel

In conclusion, let me return to the charges that Lyndon LaRouche and his movement are anti-Semitic and anti-Israel. A little more than a week ago, I spoke in Tel Aviv to Meir Pa’il, a former officer of the Israeli army and a one-time member of the Knesset, Israel’s parliament. Mr. Pa’il spoke with high approval of Lyndon LaRouche’s plan for a Middle East economic community including Israel, much needed if there is to be peace and prosperity in the area. Such a Marshall Plan—and, again, that is the way it has been called, and I always object to the use of “Marshall”—as envisioned by Mr. LaRouche, would be contingent on a secure peace between Israel and its Arab neighbors, based on a settlement of the West Bank controversy, the territory to be integrated into Jordan or become a non-militarized Palestinian state. Whether such a solution is possible is problematic, but according to Mr. Pa’il, it would have the support today of some 30% of Israelis—hardly an index of anti-Jewish bias.

Mr. LaRouche’s views on Israel and the Middle East are certainly controversial, but by no stretch of the imagination can they be considered anti-Semitic or anti-Israeli. Ironically, many Arabs would find Mr. LaRouche’s views on the Middle East as obnoxious as does the extremist Anti-Defamation League. But they are views to be considered and they can be an opening toward some kind of a settlement in the Middle East, a settlement which would ensure Israel’s security and take into account the feelings and interests of Arabs.

This has been a very, very brief account of a very brief journey, talking to people in Germany, in France, and Israel, about Lyndon LaRouche, about his movement, and about what they think of him.

To repeat, I think it is highly significant that all the rumor, the dis- and misinformation and the attack on Mr. LaRouche and his movement as anti-Semitic was laid to rest by my conversations in Israel, a country which is as sensitive on this issue as any in the world.

Thank you for your time and your patience.