

The frameup of Harrison Williams

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.,
Founder and Contributing Editor

Proven innocent of all specific crimes alleged, Senator Harrison Williams of New Jersey was framed, openly and shamelessly, by the worst lot of judges and prosecutors seen in English-speaking law since the bloody assizes of the 17th century.

If he was proven innocent of all alleged crimes, as he was, of what precisely was such an innocent person convicted in federal court? He was convicted of violation of an *ex post facto* law concocted out of the mouth of a federal judge.

That is the plain and simple kernel of the case. I call any man a liar who says this is not so.

A senator of the United States was convicted, not of any offense or morally tainted action. He was convicted on the *ex post facto* charge that he might, in some matter not tried before the court, have a "disposition" for corrupted behavior at some future time and place.

If such a conviction is upheld as a precedent in law, then let us quickly send three-quarters of the Congress to federal prison, beginning with the Senate "Ethics Committee," which bent to the corrupting influence of political pressures in the matter now before our attention.

If the Senate "Ethics Committee" had acted responsibly and morally, it would have thrown out the charges against Senator Williams, and drawn up a bill of impeachment against offending parties, including most emphatically the "Sir George Jeffreys" of the case, Judge George C. Pratt of the Federal District Court of the Eastern District of New York.

The irresponsible and immoral conduct of the Senate "Ethics Committee" demands our attention on two counts of the case.

The first cause is that "Ethics Committee's" condoning of a monstrous precedent in judicial tyranny. If a United States senator can be fraudulently charged and convicted in the manner Sen. Harrison Williams has been, no private citizen is safe from even more monstrous injustice imposed by sheer caprice of judges who are corrupt.

The second cause is that the "Ethics Committee" has

condoned a large-scale, willful effort to destroy the constitutional authority of the Congress of the United States. It is sufficiently documented that the operation usually known as Abscam-Brilab targeted preselected members of Congress for frameup, a virtually treasonous action launched under auspices of former Attorney General Benjamin Civiletti to the included intent of breaking the will of Congress.

Congressional morality

Does Congress have the morality to exonerate Williams?

I do not know whether adequate moral fiber still exists within Congress. I state my grounds for doubting the moral capacity of many members.

During 1980, the Carter administration issued a document entitled *Global 2000*. This *Global 2000* proposed that the policy of the United States must be to perpetrate genocide on a scale vastly greater than that accomplished by Adolf Hitler. Former Secretary of State Edmund Muskie, who presented the *Global 2000* to the press, admitted such a savage genocide to be the purpose of the report, and praised the report on such counts.

There are members of Congress on both sides of the aisle so degenerate or so swayed by political-opportunism that they variously promote or condone policies more hideous in their consequences than those perpetrated by Albert Speer and others under Adolf Hitler. From a Congress so bereft of elementary morality one must expect such renderings as the Senate "Ethics Committee" has reported in the Williams case.

This problem is by no means limited to the morally defective members within the Congress.

Under Henry A. Kissinger's two terms as Acting President of the United States, agencies committed to genocide on a scale vastly greater than Hitler's were made institutions of both the National Security Council and State Department. These included the Ad Hoc Population Group of the National Security Council,



and the Committee on Population Affairs of the State Department. These criminal entities are still functioning under a nominal Catholic, Secretary Alexander Haig, who should have purged them from government. They exist under direct supervision of a nominal Catholic, Deputy Secretary James Buckley.

The stink of monstrous personal hypocrisy as well as fathomless immorality otherwise, permeates many corners of our federal government, as well as among such neo-Malthusian private institutions as the Ford Foundation, the Draper Fund, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Sierra Club, the Aspen Institute, the World Wildlife Fund, and the self-styled "environmentalists" generally.

It is not accidental that a Congress which continues to condone genocide worse than that accomplished by Adolf Hitler can also stomach a seditious effort to destroy the Congress through such evil means as we witness in the Williams case.

It is not unrelated to this erosion of our national morality that successive administrations, Congresses and federal courts have winked lasciviously at the emergence of the international pornography traffic as a financial and political power second only to the closest political ally of the porno-kings, the promoters of legalization of use of and traffic in mind-destroying drugs.

The behavior of the "Ethics Committee" in the Williams case is not a matter to be studied in isolation from the general pattern of erosion of the institutions and popular morality of our nation. We stand on the brink of a monetary and economic collapse worse than that of the 1930s, and we are plunging toward thermonuclear brinksmanship at a speed accelerated by lightning of our military of the burden of adequate armaments.

The so-called Anglo-American empire which appeared almost all-powerful at the close of the last war now shows signs it is determined to follow the precedents of disgraceful collapse earlier modeled by Babylon and Rome. What we are doing to ourselves portends the oblivion of a Sodom and Gomorrah.

We are being destroyed as a nation from within. The behavior of the "Ethics Committee" in the Williams matter is merely consistent with the accelerating erosion of our nation's moral fitness to survive.

The only thing which might save us is to see clearly what we are becoming, to see clearly the monstrous economic depression and possibly worse which awaits us unless we repudiate, and very quickly, the processes of moral degeneration which have seemed to rule us increasingly since, approximately, the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

If the Senate can find in itself the moral strength to

Jack Anderson blasts Ethics Committee

The Sept. 11 installment of syndicated columnist Jack Anderson's commentaries on the Williams case pointed to a key constitutional issue. Excerpts follow.

The Justice Department's pursuit of Sen. Harrison A. Williams, Jr. (D-N.J.) led the prosecutors to commit a long list of improprieties. Not the least among them was the stage-managing of the Senate investigation into his ethics.

In effect, they tried him twice on the same dubious evidence. The Senate should have made its own independent determination of Williams's guilt in the Abscam case. The presence of the ubiquitous prosecutors in the Senate wings raises a troubling question: how far should the executive branch be allowed to go in its efforts to drive a U.S. senator out of office?

Williams wanted the Senate Ethics Committee to conduct a full investigation. . . . Instead, Justice Department officials were allowed to guide the committee from backstage. . . . Long before Williams was found guilty, courtroom observers spotted a frequent visitor huddling with Abscam prosecutor Thomas Puccio during the trial. The mysterious stranger was identified by witnesses as the Ethics Committee's counsel, Donald Sanders. . . .

The senator requested extra time to prepare his case and present it at a public hearing. He was turned down. Yet the committee granted the Justice Department months to prepare its case against Williams, which was presented to the senators behind closed doors. This star chamber presentation—Williams was not allowed to be on hand to confront his accusers—did not persuade all the members. . . .

Several were convinced the Justice Department didn't have a case against him. In fact . . . at one of the closed sessions a Justice Department official conceded that the facts did not match the law. The committee should have subpoenaed the prosecution records immediately. Instead, then-chairman Howell Heflin (D-Ala.) gave the department an additional three months to make a case against Williams.

repudiate the recommendations of the "Ethics Committee" in the Williams case, that would serve as a turning-point, a reversal of the process of moral decay infecting our citizens and our leading institutions.

I think I do not exaggerate the significance of such proposed action in the Williams case.

The chief feature of the process by which we have become immoral, and often insane, in our judgments is the substitution of "consensus" for independent, rational judgement. We used to ridicule some of those defendants in the trials of Nazis at Nuremberg, whose argument in defense was "I only carried out orders." Is there an important difference between saying "I carried out orders," and saying "I had to go along with the prevailing consensus?"

Each member of Congress is morally responsible for whatever consequences ensue from each decision. That member is personally accountable morally, and if that person is moral, must act on the basis of reason and conscience even if he or she is a minority of one in Congress or party. That is the quality of representation the citizen of a republic has a right to expect; that is the quality of representation those citizens ought to demand.

Granted, our citizens themselves often behave immorally at the polls. Often, they vote for a candidate not because of the candidate's character and policies, but chiefly because they believe the candidate might win despite their vote, and because they view the candidate as a "lesser evil" among those who might be elected. Others support candidates because they believe they have made an advantageous "private deal" on this or that issue. "To the devil with the nation; I have to take care of my own interests!"

In the Williams case, the prevailing consensus is to "dump him." Most of those congressmen who are inclined to support the "dump" decision either know that Senator Williams is innocent, or would prefer not to listen to any of the evidence which would embarrass them with that reality. "Look," they say, "the decision has been made, and I'm going along with it." Are those congressmen any better than the Nazi war criminals we used to ridicule for "only taking orders"?

Therefore, if a majority of the Senate could muster the morality of practice to repudiate the irrationalist rantings of Judge Pratt, that courage to go against the "prevailing consensus" would mean a revolution in morality within the Congress. Many of the senators who found the courage to act honorably in support of Senator Williams, would confide to their wives that same night: "For the first time in years in politics, I really feel clean tonight. It's a very good feeling."

If we can reverse direction in our national affairs in that way, perhaps we might survive as a nation. At least, we should have tried.

EIR

Executive Intelligence Review

Special Reports

The special reports listed below,
prepared by the EIR staff, are now available.

- 1. Prospects for Instability in the Arabian Gulf**
A comprehensive review of the danger of instability in Saudi Arabia in the coming period. Includes analysis of the Saudi military forces, and the influence of left-wing forces, and pro-Khomeini networks in the country. \$250.
- 2. Energy and Economy: Mexico in the Year 2000**
A development program for Mexico compiled jointly by Mexican and American scientists. Concludes Mexico can grow at 12 percent annually for the next decade, creating a \$100 billion capital-goods export market for the United States. Detailed analysis of key economic sectors; ideal for planning and marketing purposes. \$250.
- 3. Who Controls Environmentalism**
A history and detailed grid of the environmentalist movement in the United States. Analyzes sources of funding, political command structure, and future plans. \$50.
- 4. Prospects for Instability in Nigeria**
A full analysis of Nigeria's economic development program from a political standpoint. Includes review of federal-state regulations, analysis of major regional power blocs, and the environment for foreign investors. \$250.
- 5. The Significance of the Shakeup at Pemex**
EIR correctly forecast the political troubles of former Pemex director Jorge Díaz Serrano, and this report provides the full story of the recent shakeup at Pemex. Includes profile of new Pemex director Julio Rodolfo Moctezuma Cid, implications of the Pemex shakeup for the upcoming presidential race, and consequences for Mexico's energy policy. \$200.
- 6. What is the Trilateral Commission?**
The most complete analysis of the background, origins, and goals of this much-talked-about organization. Demonstrates the role of the commission in the Carter administration's Global 2000 report on mass population reduction; in the P-2 scandal that collapsed the Italian government this year; and in the Federal Reserve's high interest-rate policy. Includes complete membership list. \$100.
- 7. Near-Term Prospects for Gold Price Increase**
A political guide to the reasons for the recent decline in the price of gold, and likely price movements in the future. Includes analysis of control over international private gold stocks, ongoing efforts to corner the market, and review of scenarios now in circulation for remonetizing gold. \$500.

EIR

EXECUTIVE INTELLIGENCE REVIEW

I would like to receive these EIR Special Reports:

Order Number(s) _____

Bill me for \$ _____ Enclosed is \$ _____

Please charge to my VISA Master Charge

Card No. _____

Signature _____ Exp. Date _____

Name _____

Title _____

Company _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Telephone (_____) _____

area code

Make checks payable to:

Executive Intelligence Review, Dept. MC-1, 304 West 58th Street, 5th floor, New York, N.Y. 10019 (212) 247-8820.