

Judge denies first amendment rights

Boston Federal Judge A. David Mazzone and "blueblood" U.S. Attorney William Weld have once again demonstrated that their legal standards are closer to the Soviet legal system than the American Constitution—a charge previously made against the pair in a July 1 decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On Oct. 3, Mazzone and Weld threw the First Amendment out the courthouse window, in threatening to jail Elliot Israel Greenspan, a leader of the National Democratic Policy Committee and candidate for Congress in New Jersey. Mazzone held Greenspan in contempt of court for asserting his First Amendment rights, and gave him 48 hours to "purge" himself of contempt or report to the federal marshal for imprisonment. Mazzone said that if Greenspan continued to assert his First Amendment rights, he would entertain a motion by the government to charge Greenspan with *criminal* contempt—which would result in a formal indictment and trial.

However, Greenspan's attorneys had already told the court that Greenspan would answer the three specific questions put to him by Assistant U.S. Attorney Daniel Small—without guaranteeing that he would answer further questions. A legal brief submitted by Greenspan's attorney stated: "Greenspan stands ready to answer the three questions posed to him by the United States Attorney as long as he is not waiving his right to assert his First Amendment privileges in response to more intrusive questions. . . . It is not clear at this juncture as to the extent the Government will attempt to probe into the structures of the political organizations with whom Mr. Greenspan is affiliated, the identities of co-workers, other volunteers, fund-raising, and political activities. Response to certain questions could easily produce a quantity of information that is none of the Grand Jury's business."

Greenspan has every reason to fear an effort to strip him of his rights under the U.S. Constitution—the judge and prosecutor in the case have become notorious for politically motivated prosecutions, and have already had their un-American bias sharply rebuked by a higher court. Last July, overturning a Weld-Mazzone conviction that showed the same pattern of political targeting, the Appeals Court charged the two with imitating the principle of "crimes by analogy" which is an article in the Soviet Criminal Code, but is contrary to U.S. Constitutional standards. In that case, the Appeals Court reversed the conviction and dismissed the indictment of

Theodore Anzalone, a top fund-raiser for ex-Boston Mayor Kevin White, who had been relentlessly targeted by Weld.

Judge Mazzone made it clear from the beginning of the Oct. 3 hearing that he was going to rule on behalf of U.S. Attorney Weld. He continually asserted that the First Amendment has nothing to do with an investigation of "credit card fraud," despite the arguments of attorneys for Greenspan and for Campaigner Publications that the FBI would use the information to harass supporters and contributors. "I don't think the First Amendment has anything to do with it," said Mazzone.

Observers believe that once Greenspan repeats his willingness to answer the three questions, Mazzone will be forced to rule that Greenspan is no longer in contempt. However, Mazzone has made it clear that he will grant Weld's request to hold a hearing on whether or not Greenspan should be charged with criminal contempt, if he continues to assert his rights under the First Amendment.

Following the hearing, Greenspan reaffirmed his belief that Weld's investigation is simply a "political witchhunt" targeting LaRouche and his associates. "The issue of credit card fraud is a bogus issue. The only fraud I am aware of, is the fraudulent investigation being run by Weld, the friend of the drug-money boys. Weld is just looking for information with which the FBI can harass my political associates and their supporters and contributors. Under the U.S. Constitution, which Judge Mazzone once took an oath to uphold, I have a right to associate freely for political purposes, without illegal interference by corrupt government prosecutors and the FBI. I intend to protect that right."

Bank of Boston coverup

A. David Mazzone is known in Boston as a "gutless wonder" who routinely gives government prosecutors whatever they asked for. Last spring, Mazzone improperly cited four "LaRouche-related" organizations for contempt of court and levied fines of \$10,000 a day against them. Later he permitted a totally illegal effort by Weld's office to collect money judgments from two of the organizations. Mazzone's earlier rulings are now on appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals in Boston.

He is also the same judge who officially approved Weld's plea-bargain settlement with the Bank of Boston, in which the Bank of Boston paid a mere \$500,000 slap-on-the-wrist fine, after pleading guilty to laundering over \$1.2 billion from Swiss banks—transactions described by a high Treasury Department official as corresponding to drug-money laundering. One of the Swiss banks involved was *Crédit Suisse*, an institution in which Weld's family has a major financial interest through the former White Weld investment firm. The Bank of Boston was also one of the principal instigators of Weld's grand-jury investigation against "LaRouche-related" organizations.

The Trilateral Conspiracy Against The U.S. Constitution: Fact Or Fiction?



Executive Intelligence Review
Price: \$250

Order from:
EIR News Service,
P.O. Box 17390,
Washington, D.C. 20041-0390
Order #85019

David Rockefeller: To some, the Trilateral Commission is a sinister plot by Eastern Establishment businessmen who will do almost anything—including going into cahoots with the Kremlin—for the sake of financial gain. The fact that many former members, including President Carter, are now members of the Administration is hailed as proof of how devilishly well the conspiracy works.

—Letter to the editor of the *New York Times*, Aug. 25, 1980

Moscow: The Trilateral Commission has opposed some of the military programs adopted by Washington which threaten to upset the strategic balance.

—Yu. Fedorov, in *International Affairs*, July 1985

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.: The general object from the side of the Liberal Establishments was to establish a global *Pax Romana*, a thousand-year empire of shared global rule between the Trilaterals and the Soviet empire. . . . It happens, however, that the Soviets intend to cheat. They will maintain their partnership with the Liberal Establishments no longer than the Trilaterals and similar types continue to be "useful fools" working to advantage of Soviet imperial interests. Once the usefulness of those fools has been exhausted, the Soviets will variously assimilate or obliterate them.

—Foreword to *The Trilateral Conspiracy Against the U.S. Constitution: Fact or Fiction?*

To destroy the evil influence of the Trilateral Commission in American political life, one must expose the delusions in which the Trilaterals obsessively believe. *EIR's* Special Report provides a comprehensive textual analysis and refutation of key Trilateral writings, including: Zbigniew Brzezinski's delphic attacks on the Strategic Defense Initiative; George Shultz's argument for the decline of American power and influence; David Rockefeller's "socialism." Foreword by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.