

Editorial

Who is this man?

On Oct. 6, oral arguments on behalf of Lyndon LaRouche and his co-defendants will be heard by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. While the appeal itself will be argued by former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark, it will be backed up by 804 American lawyers who have filed an *amici curiae* brief on behalf of LaRouche's constitutional rights—these in addition to European and other American individual *amicus* briefs submitted as well.

The men and women who are joining this appeal would, in most cases, never have supposed that they would be siding with LaRouche—a man whom most of them would consider a political maverick. Nonetheless, the enormity of the miscarriage of justice in this case, and the ongoing witchhunt against associates of LaRouche, have made these eminent jurists fear for the political health of the United States.

The signators include state senators, presidents of regional bar associations as well as national minority bar associations, former judges, heads of trial lawyers' associations, and eminent legal authorities from the academic sphere. The signators represent a wide spectrum of political viewpoints on every issue except their absolute commitment to the defense of the U.S. Constitution.

While we wholeheartedly endorse this constitutional defense, we can say with certainty, that the defense of LaRouche is a defense of the United States also because of the unique role which LaRouche himself has played in shaping policy. Some of his proposals, such as President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative, have been adopted—if only partially. Others, such as the economic policies urged by LaRouche over the past 15 and more years, are now being carefully studied, as a collapse looms.

The War on Drugs is a case in point, of how LaRouche has shaped policy, and the bitter results of the failure of his policies to be properly implemented.

In the late 1970s, it was LaRouche who first called it a *war on drugs*. At his urging, the book *Dope, Inc.* was published and sold internationally. Here was revealed the workings of the upper levels of the drug cartel, the reality that drug traffic and terrorism are one

and the same—*narco-terrorism*; and the links between the KGB and dirty intelligence networks in the West were spelled out.

The book was translated into several languages, and it inspired the publication, also in many languages, of the magazine *War on Drugs*. Anti-Drug coalitions were formed throughout Europe, in the United States, and in Ibero-America.

Besides exposing how hundreds of billions of dollars of drug money were supporting an international, unregulated black economy, these Coalitions declared war on those who were urging legalization of drugs, often in the form of "decriminalization." This was not merely a literary campaign, although it featured extensive documentation of the potentially irreversible, destructive effects of drug use particularly on young people, and polemicized against the corrupting role of rock music.

In the United States, for example, the National Anti-Drug Coalition took great pride in its role in defeating Jimmy Carter for reelection in 1980, because he brought the marijuana legalization lobby into the White House and put it in charge of drug policy.

Lyndon LaRouche would not now be serving a 15-year sentence after a railroad trial which is best compared to the scandalous frameup of French Capt. Alfred Dreyfus, had he not made a lot of powerful enemies, not least the Soviets who have resented his repeated identification of their calculated campaigns to spread *desinformatsia*. The Soviets fear LaRouche as the man who best understands their unremitting drive toward world empire; but perhaps LaRouche's most bitter enemies are the top controllers of the international drug cartel.

You can be assured that men like Hafez Assad, who is the major narco-terrorist controller in the Mideast, and his admirer Henry A. Kissinger, are determined that LaRouche's period of imprisonment will be a life sentence.

On Oct. 6, LaRouche's appeal will be argued in open court, but it is not he who is really on trial; it is rather the fate of the United States which is to be determined.