

Charges highlighted by NBC slander dropped against LaRouche associates

On May 21, an NBC Nightly News broadcast represented the fundraising practices of Lyndon LaRouche's political supporters and associates as generally fraudulent and threatening, targeting the elderly in particular. In support of such allegations, NBC showed videotape of 89-year-old Harriet Driver of Oregon, Illinois, on camera in a wheelchair in a nursing home. During two brief snippets, Mrs. Driver said that she had felt as if she had been "hypnotized" and that she believed she would not have suffered a recent stroke had she not testified as the prosecution's chief witness at the trial of three LaRouche supporters.

Whatever Mrs. Driver meant to convey, the clear implication of the NBC News broadcast was that her suffering was the fault of LaRouche and his associates.

The truth is somewhat different, as was revealed in court June 1. There Ogle County prosecutor Dennis Schumacher, after being challenged on his ruthless efforts as part of a nationwide "Get LaRouche" task force to exploit Harriet Driver, suddenly asked for a dismissal of all charges against the LaRouche defendants. Judge Alan Cargerman then dismissed the case, which had turned into a humiliating defeat for the task force.

This ended a ten-month-long prosecutorial witchhunt, one of the most far-fetched and outlandish in U.S. judicial history, by State's Attorney Schumacher.

Fundraising a crime?

At Schumacher's instigation, on Aug. 17, 1989, LaRouche associates Ron Fredman, Patricia Noble-Schenk, and Richard Blomquist had been indicted on a total of 18 counts of robbery, intimidation, theft by threat, and residential burglary. Their only "crime" was obtaining political contributions from Mrs. Driver.

Two of the defendants, Fredman and Noble-Schenk, were candidates for statewide office in the Illinois Democratic Party primary March 20.

From the beginning, defense attorney Michael Null told the court that prosecutor Schumacher's behavior was immoral, unethical, and reckless, and that he saw Mrs. Driver, or any other senior citizen, as merely bait to convict his clients, even at the cost of her life.

Reckless, indeed. At one point, the prosecutor had given

defendant Pat Noble-Schenk immunity in return for her testimony before the grand jury, only to withdraw it four days later, just before she was indicted. Attorney Null argued that that was improper and an abuse which should result in the charges against her being dismissed.

Prosecutor Schumacher's reply came in a statement to the press: "I'm going to hang Pat Schenk from the courthouse steps."

Judge Cargerman did throw out, without an evidentiary hearing, Schumacher's bizarre contempt actions against LaRouche associates Tom Szymecko and Gene Schenk, as well as against defense attorney Null and Pat Noble-Schenk's attorney, Dennis Zitzer. Szymecko and Gene Schenk, subpoenaed as witnesses before the grand jury, and their attorneys, had been cited by Schumacher for contempt for an alleged failure to appear—after Schumacher himself had dismissed the grand jury and sent it home!

At another point, Schumacher had improperly given names from telephone records subpoenaed for the grand jury to Harriet Driver's attorneys, who had then called them to solicit participation in a class action suit against the defendants and their employer, Midwest Circulation Corp. Judge Cargerman granted a temporary restraining order against the prosecutor for this, and directed that all such grand jury materials be returned.

A stroke on the witness stand

The defendants were put on trial on March 7 of this year. That trial ended abruptly, with Judge Cargerman declaring a mistrial, when Harriet Driver suffered a stroke on the witness stand and was hospitalized after being questioned for only 45 minutes by prosecutor Schumacher.

Courtroom observers noted that Mrs. Driver appeared to be a highly reluctant witness testifying under heavy pressure, and at the time of her stroke, her testimony had conspicuously failed to support Schumacher's charges.

One juror told defense counsel afterward, "I didn't think her testimony proved she was robbed or threatened. The state's attorney was trying to put one over on us."

Throughout her testimony, she continued to refer to the defendants by their first names, and described the reasons for her political support of their ideas. In a fashion hardly

consistent with that of someone who has been robbed, she described each of the series of conversations and visits that occurred with "Pat and Ron." The worst she had to say was that she had acted "like a fool." Never did she say she had been robbed, threatened, or frightened, as prosecutor Schumacher charged.

What was clear from the beginning of Schumacher's witchhunt, and from Mrs. Driver's testimony, is that she had been pressured to testify, and that pressure had been applied by Schumacher. What was also obvious from her testimony, was that she was in an internal struggle between the truth and what Schumacher had attempted to convince her she needed to say to make his case.

Although after her stroke and hospitalization, Mrs. Driver was confined to a nursing home and her medical condition remained uncertain, State's Attorney Schumacher repeatedly expressed his intention to retry the case.

Congressional candidate LaRouche commented on Schumacher's zeal to force the stroke victim to continue to testify, "What does Schumacher wish to do? Does he wish to kill the woman? He appears to be in total reckless disregard of the fact that he might."

Nevertheless, on April 17, Schumacher announced that he had not finished with Mrs. Driver. Although Schumacher reported to Judge Cargerman that her doctors had said testifying again would pose a grave risk to her health, that she would never be able to testify in open court, and would spend the rest of her life in a nursing home, the State's Attorney insisted that he would attempt to secure her testimony on videotape so that he could proceed with his absurd case. How defense attorneys were to cross examine a videotape, he did not explain.

The NBC broadcast

On May 21, Schumacher's charges received national publicity on the NBC Nightly News program. But on June 1, defense attorney Michael Null filed a motion asking Judge Cargerman to compel NBC and Schumacher to produce documents and unbroadcast videotapes relating to the May 21 broadcast. Null's motion charged that Schumacher "arranged, promoted, and induced" the interview of Mrs. Driver, and "stepped outside of his prosecutorial role and acted as a zealous advocate of anti-LaRouche action, giving the lie to his statements that he is not conducting these prosecutions because of the defendants' First Amendment activities and beliefs."

Suddenly, after the filing of Null's motion to compel discovery, Schumacher decided to drop the charges that very day.

What the defense had already learned should have made prosecutor Schumacher nervous.

According to the medical records of Harriet Driver, obtained by a defense subpoena, prosecutor Schumacher had personally visited Harriet Driver on May 3, and informed the

nurse on duty that an NBC interview would be conducted on May 4. This was then confirmed through Mrs. Driver's daughter, Mary Ann.

The medical record also states on May 4 that Harriet Driver "does not want to be interviewed." Despite this, the interview took place.

Referencing the TV broadcast, Null's motion pointed out that "NBC employee Pat Lynch is a material witness relevant to the bad-faith nature of the prosecution as part of a nationwide 'get-LaRouche' task force including both governmental and non-governmental entities and individuals. An individual named Mira Boland, an employee of the Anti-Defamation League, was named on Dennis Schumacher's list of witnesses for the first trial in these cases. In testimony in the case of *Commonwealth v. Welsh* [in Virginia], Mira Boland indicates that she attended a meeting at the home of an individual named John Train to discuss Lyndon LaRouche, at which

Schumacher admits unprofessional conduct

In mid-April 1990, Ogle County, Illinois State's Attorney Dennis Schumacher was cited for "grave misconduct" by the Illinois State Disciplinary Commission. The Disciplinary Commission found that Schumacher had failed to recuse himself in a case where he had a clear conflict of interest.

The complaint to the commission arose out of a grand jury investigation of alleged sexual abuse of an elementary school child in Ogle County. The investigation was conducted by Schumacher's office. The child was a student at a school run by a fundamentalist church congregation, of which Schumacher is a board member.

It was alleged that Schumacher, who has fiduciary as well as oversight responsibilities for the church, not only did not remove himself from the investigation, but impeded the grand jury by preparing witnesses who were his friends and associates at the church. Apparently the man who threatened to "hang Pat Schenk from the courthouse steps" and who endangered the life of witness Harriet Driver in his zeal to prosecute LaRouche's associates, has shown himself capable of unprincipled, immoral, and unethical behavior in other cases as well.

The present charges against Schumacher arise from several instances of child abuse in the spring of 1988 that occurred at the Faith Christian School, an elementary school run by the Faith Assembly of Grand Detour. Schu-

meeting Roy Godson, an individual connected with the National Security Council and Pat Lynch, together with other members of the press were in attendance.”

As Null’s motion indicated, in any new trial, the entire history of the “Get LaRouche” task force and all prosecutions of LaRouche’s associates and LaRouche himself might have been reopened for examination.

Sources close to the case say that defense attorney Null only found out that charges had been dropped when he was telephoned by attorneys for NBC, who said they had been informed by Schumacher.

Political pressure

Whatever prompted Schumacher’s request to drop the charges, he did not explain his reasoning to the defense. Perhaps his friends at the state capital at Springfield advised him to cut his losses. Schumacher has worked

closely with both Illinois Attorney General Neil Hartigan, and Secretary of State Jim Edgar, respectively, the Democratic and Republican candidates for governor, in his witchhunt against supporters of LaRouche in Illinois. Ever since the March 1986 victory of two friends of LaRouche in statewide primary races, they and the national “Get LaRouche” task force have worked overtime to prevent, by any means necessary, LaRouche Democrats from being given ballot access.

And the zealous Schumacher isn’t through. Afterward, he told press that he would follow up his collapsed prosecution with an attempt to get a new law passed in Illinois. That law would state that no money could be raised from a person over 65 after 9:00 p.m. It would also put a ceiling of \$1,000 on any political contribution by a person over 65! Dennis Schumacher continues to be a menace to the U.S. Constitution.

macher is a member of the Board of Trustees of the Faith Assembly, and is also a personal guarantor of loans taken by the church for both the construction of its building and that of the school.

In July 1988, parents whose children had allegedly been physically abused, retained counsel to file a damage suit against the church and its trustees for negligence. However, before the action could be filed, Schumacher reportedly moved to intimidate them from actually doing so, by threatening to haul them all before a grand jury. Using the pretext of an investigation of several more serious alleged instances of child abuse, given him by the parents themselves, he convened a grand jury, using it to harass the parents and their children. The grand jury returned no indictments on the child abuse charges, and the lawsuit was dropped.

The Disciplinary Commission found that Schumacher had improperly failed to remove and isolate himself from the investigation and the State’s Attorney’s presentation to the grand jury. It further found that, although there was no clear evidence, there was a sufficient amount of “smoke” to warrant “serious concern” on the role played by Schumacher in handling witnesses he knew and had personal and religious affiliation with, prior to their testimony before the grand jury.

Stopping short of a finding of obstruction of the investigation, the Disciplinary Commission found that the evidence presented went beyond simply the “mere appearance of impropriety” which is the standard used for recusal in cases. They further chastised Schumacher for the appearance of less than even-handedness, which they said undermines the faith in the State’s Attorney which those who elected him have the right to expect.

Schumacher and other church elders have also been the subject of charges of financial impropriety. It is alleged that Schumacher and other church officials issued promissory notes for loans from church members and then utilized the funds for purposes other than that for which they had been intended.

On April 20, Schumacher filed court papers admitting to prosecutorial misconduct and conflict of interest:

“a. Conduct involving the acceptance of employment when the exercise of Respondent’s professional judgment on behalf of the People of Illinois was or reasonably may have been affected by Respondent’s own financial, business or personal interest, in violation of Rule 5-101(a) of the Illinois Code of Professional Conduct.

“b. Failure as a lawyer to represent his client the People of Illinois, with undivided fidelity, in violation of Rule 5-107(a) of the Illinois Code of Professional Conduct.

“c. Conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice in violation of Rule 5-102(a)(5) of the Illinois Code of Professional Conduct.”

By filing this admission, Schumacher apparently hoped to receive only a “censure” for his violations, amounting to a slap on the wrist. The Illinois Supreme Court, however, could still reject his petition and proceed with hearings, which very well might result in a stiffer finding, possibly forcing him to resign or forbidding him to continue the practice of law.

According to a source intimately familiar with the complaint, the Supreme Court is being asked to review charges that Schumacher’s conduct in the whole affair was nothing more than intimidation directed at quashing a civil damage action which named Schumacher, among others, as personally liable to the tune of over \$1 million.