

Editorial

Wall Street Journal's immorality

The gentlemen, so-called, of the *Wall Street Journal's* editorial page, no friends of ours for many years, for once, displayed their swinish morality in public, in the form of an editorial titled *Prosecutorial Indiscretion*, in their Aug. 13 edition, wholly devoted to a shrill, hysterical attack against Irangate's Independent Counsel Lawrence E. Walsh, the so-called Special Prosecutor. The *Wall Street Journal's* editorial argument, simply summarized, is: *Do not allow that s.o.b. Walsh to prosecute anyone involved in the illegal, secret government behind Irangate.*

The *Journal's* editors essentially accuse Mr. Walsh of nurturing a personal morality which is in direct conflict with the judicial policy of the Department of Justice. The personal moral code of Mr. Walsh which the *Journal* finds intolerable, is summarized in the following passage from a speech Mr. Walsh gave at the recent American Bar Association convention. The quotation is taken from the *Journal's* editorial which cites it:

"The New Testament, like the Old, embodies a horror of falsehood; for example, the sin of lying to the Holy Spirit through Apostle Peter, Ananias and his wife Sapphira were struck dead. From their origins in the Bible, truth and the rule of law took root in the common law of England in the Middle Ages. . . . The English Revolution of the 1640s and the Glorious Revolution of 1688 settled that the King was indeed under the law." Upon hearing such unheard of praise for truth and law, the righteous Pharisees of the *Wall Street Journal* proceed to tear their blow-dried hair and rend asunder their robes. Why, they howl in indignation, this man Walsh believes that he is not answerable to anyone but the law—or, in their words:

"Mr. Walsh clearly sees his post as anything but an 'inferior officer' of the executive branch, and sees himself answerable to no one save his own vision of justice."

To whom, we ask the Pharisees and scribes of the *Journal*, should a judge hold himself answerable, if not to his innermost "vision of justice"? Is not justice, more than any other service and function of government, supposed to be the most independent, the most incorruptible, the most sovereign, the one which, more than any other is

answerable to no one save its own conscience? Is not this sovereignty of judgment what has made justice what it is across the ages?

No, the *Wall Street Journal* scribes counter. Judges must hold themselves answerable not to their inner vision of justice, but instead to a certain corporate lawyer from Maryland, namely Benjamin Civiletti, the Carter administration's Attorney General. What the *Journal's* scribes particularly admire of Civiletti's many legal accomplishments, is his theory of selective prosecution which, under the official title of "prosecutorial discretion," was applied in the infamous "Brilab" and "Abscam" travesties of the Carter era. This Civiletti Principle of Federal Prosecution, the Bible of Justice Department black-bag jobs against political opponents, in part, was concocted to "promote the reasoned exercise of prosecutorial discretion . . . a determination to prosecute represents a policy judgment that the fundamental interests of society require the application of the criminal laws to a particular set of circumstances."

Because Mr. Walsh threatens to prosecute the criminals behind the secret government which has nearly shipwrecked the United States, the *Journal's* scribes believe that "Mr. Walsh, in short, has abandoned the whole of prosecutorial discretion."

The Civiletti doctrine of selective prosecution was written for the purpose of selectively targeting the *Wall Street Journal's* editorial page's scribes' enemies, and not their friends in McFarlane's and Poindexter's National Security Council. The Civiletti doctrine was supposed to be applied against the enemies of Leo Cherne's and Edward Bennett Williams's President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, in short, for those who know, against the enemies of "The Trust," and not against its friends, as Mr. Walsh now threatens to do.

The *Journal's* scribes played a dark, yet untold role in mobilizing Justice Department "prosecutorial discretion," or "selective prosecution," against *EIR*. No wonder they now come to the rescue of their corrupt fellows in the Justice Department.