

to dismiss the case on grounds of selective and vindictive prosecution, the government was nevertheless required to reveal some explosive facts under discovery rulings and agreements. Additionally, because the government delayed so long in providing its “discovery” material, the defendants were able to obtain other relevant information through the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). It was through FOIA, for example, that the defense in Boston learned that NSC aide Oliver North had communicated with some of his private intelligence cronies, who had “collected info against LaRouche.”

In the Boston trial, evidence was only heard consistently from the end of December through February. March and April were largely occupied with hearings on government misconduct and hearings under the Classified Information Procedures Act (CIPA). Indeed, during the last 10 weeks of the trial, the jury was only present to hear evidence on eight days.

The central issue of misconduct was the fact that the prosecution had hidden from the defense the identity of one

of its FBI informants who was in regular contact with the defendants—and was even using a statement by this individual, Ryan Quade Emerson, as “proof” of the conspiracy to obstruct justice by the defendants.

Finally, the government coverup was so obvious, that the judge allowed the defense to put both prosecutors and the FBI case agents on the witness stand. Publicity about the government’s use of FBI informants, and North’s involvement with LaRouche, hit the national press with a bang. The trial dragged on and on.

Finally, in early May, a mistrial was declared on grounds of juror hardship, since it was obvious that the government was nowhere near concluding its case, and that it would be followed by a lengthy defense case as well.

After the declaration of mistrial, jurors told the press that they had taken an informal poll among themselves, and had voted unanimously for acquittal of all defendants. Juror Ramon Dashowetz told the press: “There was too much question of government misconduct in what was happening to the LaRouche campaign.”

LaRouche: ‘Jury voted in support of hate propaganda’

Lyndon LaRouche made the following remarks to a packed press conference, shortly after the announcement of the jury’s verdict of guilty on the evening of Dec. 16 in Alexandria, Virginia:

I won’t belabor the obvious. We had a runaway jury which just went all the way, with no regard for fact. The question is, how could it be possible, for example, in the Eastern District of Virginia, to run a short trial with an average jury selected in the Eastern District of Virginia, and have a fair trial, for me or anyone associated with me? I think it’s almost impossible. Therefore, while the jury did not behave in a moral way, in the sense of the way they reacted, nonetheless we can’t blame them entirely for their behavior. If I had been one of the jury, of course, I’d blame myself, but I’m a little more lenient in blaming others than I am myself. Given that they’re average people, or most of them, given that the *Washington Post*, for example, has been running a hate campaign against me for more than 14 years—with the recent years, as my

influence on policy has increased, the campaign of hate against me in the liberal media has been beyond belief—it’s almost impossible to pick up a paper in which my name is mentioned, since August 1986, without the words, “political extremist.” A meaningless formulation, but to a suggestible population, an other-directed American population, that has an effect. So, obviously, the jury voted to support a verdict which had been given for over 14 years, and especially in the four most recent years, of hate propaganda by sections of the news media and others. And that’s what the verdict means.

The other side of this is more ominous. As it’s obvious to everyone, I’m a fairly tough individual, and I’m associated with friends who are tough and experienced. If we, under these circumstances of frameup—and it was an all-out frameup by a national federal-state task force, and the whole case was a lie on the government’s side—if we cannot defeat a frameup, what about the little guy out there, who suddenly finds himself framed up? Where’s his justice?

More significant than these matters of justice, which to some of you might appear esoteric, the purpose of this operation is not to put me in prison; the purpose is to kill me. Obviously, if I’m sent to prison, it’s very easy to kill me. It’s called “a natural death,” an “accident,” etc.; or some loony in the joint did it on his own. But, the question is, if I’m removed, where are the rest of you? Let me put it this way: I don’t hate George Bush, I think that’s obvious. George, as President-elect, will probably be the best President, as an

Shut-out in Alexandria

In contrast to Boston, the Alexandria case was rushed to trial without any discovery of exculpatory evidence being allowed, and with evidence of government misconduct being explicitly excluded from the trial.

First, on the date of arraignment, Judge Bryan set a trial date of only five weeks later. When there was protest from the prosecution that this might be too quick, the judge stated openly that he didn't think more than three or four of the defense's pretrial motions would even be worth reading. (To be perfectly fair, it should be noted that Bryan, who is the chief judge in the Eastern District of Virginia, follows the same procedure with all defendants. His district is known as the "rocket docket," for its rush of cases to trial. In a case of this complexity, however, the schedule was extremely prejudicial against the defendants.)

The Alexandria pretrial motions—hastily put together—were less numerous and extensive than in Boston, but still substantial. First, the defense argued that the charges in Alexandria—conspiracy to commit loan fraud—were in sub-

stance the same case as that brought in Boston, and that the constitutional prohibition against double jeopardy should either lead to the dismissal of the charges, or a transfer of the case to Boston. Second, the defense moved to separate the tax case from the loan fraud case, because of the danger of prejudicial "spill-over" between the two cases. Both of these motions were dismissed virtually out of hand, as were all the other substantive pre-trial motions. (Only a few procedural motions were granted.)

The most voluminous of the defense's pretrial motions, however, was the one for disclosure of exculpatory evidence, which sought information concerning government actions against the defendants, particularly in the area of interference with the financial and sales activities of the defendants.

It was the defense's contention, that the failure of lenders to be repaid was not the responsibility of the defendants and their companies, but was the result of outside interference by the government and private parties; the defense argued that it should be allowed to obtain such evidence and present it to the jury. These discovery requests were meticulously de-

administrator, we've had in a long time.

George will hold the ship, as well as a very good captain who happened to be captain of the *Titanic*. The problem that George has is this. He has many challenges. We're in the worst crisis that any President has faced in the 20th century. The question is, will George, as a good administrator, follow current company policy into the iceberg and sink the ship, as the good captain—and he was a good captain—of the *Titanic* did?

The most crucial aspect of the policy question facing George Bush is, will he try to do as Baker has tried to do, will he deal with this monetary, economic, and financial crisis by trying to ride out current policies through crisis management, or will he face reality and change fundamentally the monetary, financial, and economic policies that have been ruining the United States and the world for the past 20 years? If George Bush during the first 60-90 days of his administration makes the fundamental changes in monetary, financial, and economic policy required, the U.S. will weather the storm and George will have the resources to cope with the other major crises he has to face, for the sake of this nation, not just himself. If George Bush fails to deal effectively with the monetary, economic, and financial crises, then within 60-90 days, his administration will begin to fall apart and there won't be any way to put it back together again.

In that case, weep for this United States and weep for civilization.

My function is not to gain personal prestige for myself. I never cared for it, I never sought money, I never sought

personal prestige. I have other things that are important to me, and that keep me happy. For example, tomorrow, I'm having a scientific seminar and I'm going to be very happy with that. My function is the service I have performed for the United States and civilization.

One thing I shall leave behind me, if I'm killed: I have set into motion—not entirely on my own initiative, but on the basis of discussion with relevant influential people in various parts of the world—a worldwide movement, an anti-Bolshevik resistance movement, which is prepared to fight to prevent this civilization from going under communist rule. To fight by the kinds of methods which the Chinese call People's War.

If this sentence goes through, the way the jury voted, I'm dead. You can figure that, and I'm counting on being dead. Not that I particularly like the idea, but I have to be realistic about what I face. I shall devote the remaining weeks of my life to strengthening that anti-communist resistance which will make sure that our civilization is safe and that the injustice, the kind of injustice which is imposed on people in the United States and the Third World, will not fall upon our grandchildren. Because millions of people around the world in this anti-Bolshevik movement, are willing to die to prevent communism from taking over this world.

So, I shall be very careful to put no stain on this martyr's corpse when I go out. Those who have gone after me in our government in complicity with the Soviets, will, when I'm dead, wear the Mark of the Beast in the eyes of those who are members of that movement that I lead.