

LaRouche testifies for the defense in Roanoke political frameup trial

by Warren J. Hamerman

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. took the stand for the defense in the trial of three of his associates in Roanoke, Virginia on Dec. 13, telling the court the history of the political movement that he founded and explaining the reasons behind the years-long harassment of him and his associates by his enemies of his world outlook.

Laurence Hecht, Paul Gallagher, and Anita Gallagher are on trial on trumped-up charges of "securities fraud." LaRouche, a victim of the conspiracy against him that he described on the stand, is held political prisoner by the Bush administration in the Federal Medical Facility in Rochester, Minnesota.

LaRouche began his testimony by describing his candidacies for President, the U.S. Labor Party in 1976, and the Democratic Party in 1980, 1984, and 1988. Numerous national, state, and local office candidates have run for election in association with him. The greatest number of those candidates were coordinated through a political action committee known as the National Democratic Policy Committee. These citizen candidates associated themselves in large part with LaRouche's program and philosophic orientation, and most came to be known as LaRouche Democrats. In total, 4-5,000 have run on slates with him.

LaRouche then described the forced government bankruptcy against firms associated with him, in 1987. At the time of the forced bankruptcy, over a quarter million citizens in this country were regularly receiving publications associated with his philosophic and political views.

When asked if he was guilty of any of the charges for which he had been convicted, LaRouche answered, "absolutely not."

Principles of the LaRouche movement

LaRouche described his involvement in forming the political association of which the three defendants are members. The National Caucus of Labor Committees (NCLC) is a philosophic association in the same sense as Benjamin Franklin's American Philosophical Society. It is committed to the point of view best articulated by Gottfried Leibniz and, in economics, what George Washington's administration knew as the American System of Political Economy, which was in

opposition to the British East India Company-Adam Smith conception of colonialism.

The views of the National Caucus of Labor Committees are to foster the traditional values of Western civilization, in opposition to the rock-drug-sex neo-malthusian counterculture. The NCLC fostered these views through activities which were cultural, scientific, economic, and political, and these activities radiated the basis of the American System and Western Judeo-Christian values. He reported that these values were threatened by the events of the 1960s, especially the creation of the counterculture.

LaRouche considered this as one of the most dangerous efforts, if not the most dangerous, to destroy Western civilization. Since the counterculture was targeting college-layer youth opposed to the Vietnam War, he tried to get involved and take on the poison being fed to them, since by creating a positive alternative for this world, they could not help but reject the countercultural poison.

LaRouche stated that his basic philosophic view, which has gotten him into a great deal of trouble, is that our nation was founded as a fight against the colonialism of the British, Adam Smith's free market economics. Today, we have become the heirs of King George III. We do today, in brutal terms, to developing countries, worse than the British imperialists did to us at our founding. We must commit our nation again to the philosophic orientation it had when it was founded.

We are headed into a depression, despite whatever relative good President John F. Kennedy's administration had done; we are on a course to destruction. We need to export capital goods to develop food for a hungry world, and these ideas could only work if they involved support from the average working stiff, whose life was ruined by the economy. People have a right to jobs; they need a high-technology capital boom. We have to export to Africa. This is good for our nation—it creates jobs and income. And it's good for them—it raises their standard of living.

LaRouche said this was not a radical idea, but a traditionalist idea, which developed over 2,500 years of Western civilization, commencing with Solon of Athens, through Socrates and Plato, but especially through Christianity.

Christianity is the dominant force of our civilization, he said. The Christian idea is based on the fact that there are no races, that each and every individual on the face of this Earth, has within himself or herself the divine spark of reason. All persons living on this Earth are in the living image of God, and there is no better way for the living image of God to be exercised, than for each and every individual to utilize their creative powers to the full extent that they can. They have to use their creative powers in classical culture, science, and the arts, in order to create and foster a better world for their children and grandchildren.

Economic and foreign policy role

LaRouche discussed the accuracy of his economic forecasts, and his role in developing foreign and strategic policy initiatives with world leaders, including the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). This, he said, brought him into conflict with such figures as former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

In 1973, there was a period of economic crisis in the world, the oil crisis: There were long lines at gas stations; the standard of living fell and hardship for the developing sector was very acute, especially for black Africa. At that point, LaRouche focused on getting involved in the Non-Aligned nations group, and began working with countries like Peru and Guyana, for a proposal for a New World Economic Order, which was adopted at an August 1976 Conference in Sri Lanka.

In April 1975, LaRouche was invited to Iraq, for a conference of the Ba'ath Party. He remained there for two weeks, met with many Iraqi and other Arab officials, including a brief meeting with Saddam Hussein.

LaRouche believed that there was a basis for Arab-Israeli common interest. Israel was facing an economic crisis, and the Arab world was facing an economic crisis. If they could jointly have a development perspective, there would be peace.

LaRouche went to Bonn, West Germany. He gave a press conference, which was then repeated in Milan, Italy, for his proposals for international reform known as the IDB, or International Development Bank. He then contacted every representative he could of the PLO or of the Israelis, and said, Let's get this policy moving. In November 1975, LaRouche was supposed to address a major diplomatic conference in Paris, France, involving Arabs, Saudis, and French Gaullists. The U.S. government intervened to break up that meeting. This was at a time when he had been vocal in opposition to the policies of Henry Kissinger.

LaRouche testified about his various meetings with heads of government and state, including President José López Portillo of Mexico at the end of May 1982. The context was a warning that debt relations were about to explode. LaRouche advised Mr. Portillo that the international banking authorities would take his country apart piece by piece by

September. Then LaRouche proposed specific economic defenses, and these were announced at a press conference arranged at the Presidential Palace. Other nations then asked for a special report on LaRouche's recommendations and discussions, and this led to the presentation in book form of a report known as *Operation Juárez*. This report was then sent to the U.S. National Security Council, to virtually every government of South and Central America, after its publication during the first week of August 1982.

LaRouche testified about his meetings with Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, that he met her twice, once in 1982, a second time in July 1983. They met to discuss world economic policies, and various other matters. He described his efforts to realize Operation Juárez in work with the governments of Peru, Guyana, India, Somalia, the Arab governments—20-30 governments in all, which all saw a common interest in global economic reform.

Then, things changed radically. In February 1983, just before the SDI was announced by President Reagan, Soviet spokesman Shershnev offered a representation from his government, that 1) the Russians agreed completely that the SDI was technologically feasible; 2) they agreed on its economic spillovers, but 3) they would never tolerate a joint proposal, a) because they would never negotiate military policy with an adversary, and b) their fear that they would be outmatched in a direct competition.

LaRouche believed and had evidence that the Soviets had been assured by the highest levels of the Democratic Party that LaRouche's policies in support of an SDI policy would be blocked. In March 1983, after President Reagan announced the program on TV, the Soviets abruptly broke off relations with LaRouche, and a violent and vicious Soviet press campaign against him commenced.

Adversary relation with the ADL

LaRouche described the adversary relationship of the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai Brith (ADL). He characterized the ADL as a non-membership organization, which purports to be tax-free, whose purpose was to engage, from his personal knowledge and observation, in character assassination, mud-slinging, and lying. Since May 1978, he and his associates have been victims of the ADL's activities.

LaRouche testified about the Illinois primary in March 1986, and how, when the victory of two of his associates was announced, there was a vicious character assassination story put out, that he had been the intellectual author of the assassination of Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme, that this slander had been coordinated by the ADL and NBC-TV. Irwin Suall, the director of the ADL's Fact-Finding Division, was specifically involved.

These efforts culminated in the Oct. 6, 1986 paramilitary raid on offices of his associates in Leesburg, Virginia. That raid, and ADL-directed slanders about fundraising, led directly to the trumped-up charges involved in this trial.