

Congressional candidate is illegally jailed

by Edward Spannaus

A Boston federal judge and U.S. Attorney, who have previously teamed up to cover up drug-money-laundering and to conduct political frameups, have again collaborated in the illegal jailing of a LaRouche Democrat who is a political leader and congressional candidate in New Jersey.

Elliot Israel Greenspan, candidate for the 9th Congressional District in New Jersey, was held in custody for 48 hours without just cause, in what was described by observers as "judicial terror tactics." It is believed that the jailing of Greenspan was purely for purposes of intimidation, and to "make an example" by jailing a LaRouche supporter, since Greenspan was not in contempt of court under any known legal standard.

Greenspan's jailing came as part of an effort by the FBI and U.S. Attorney William Weld to revive their flagging "investigation" of the 1984 LaRouche presidential campaign and other organizations they describe as "LaRouche-related." The Grand Jury investigation has proceeded for one year without any tangible result, and sources report that Weld is no closer to indicting anyone than he was one year ago.

Weld is well known for the use of such tactics. He was previously criticized in the *National Law Journal* for "misusing his powers to bully witnesses and manipulate the political process." He was described as using improper pressure tactics to harass witnesses, leaking information to the press, and conducting a "pernicious offensive."

Greenspan originally appeared before the Grand Jury as a "keeper of the records" for Caucus Distributors, Inc. During his appearance, Assistant U.S. Attorney Daniel Small caused Greenspan to be served with a "forthwith" personal subpoena, demanding his immediate appearance before the Grand Jury to answer any and all personal questions. His attorneys moved to quash the subpoena, which was denied. On Oct. 3, Greenspan was held to be in "contempt of court" by Judge A. David Mazzone for refusing to answer three questions, although Greenspan had already indicated that he would answer those questions, if he was not waiving his First Amendment rights.

During the contempt hearing, Greenspan's attorney argued that the U.S. Attorney was intruding into areas protected by the First Amendment. Mazzone said: "Although these are sensitive matters, of course, when the First Amendment

is involved, what essentially the government has indicated and affirmed that it is doing is inquiring into credit-card transactions. . . . Mr. Small . . . concludes, after a series of questions, that Mr. Greenspan has disclosed all of the information he has about credit cards. Then somehow Mr. Small is going to embark on a side trip into political philosophy. . . . If he does, why doesn't Mr. Greenspan have the right at that point to refuse to answer? . . . I don't see that, if he should dare to ask those questions, Mr. Greenspan would not be alert enough to say, 'I am sorry. That's a question I want to ask my attorney about.' And you and Mr.



Congressional candidate Elliot Greenspan (r) talks to the press.

Small outside can come back to me."

When Greenspan appeared before the Grand Jury the following week, Small did not even ask the original contested questions until after four hours of questioning Greenspan about his employment, taxes, his associates' political activities, and so forth. When he finally did ask the questions, Greenspan answered them, to the effect that he had no knowledge of unauthorized credit-card charges. At that point he should have been dismissed, according to what Mazzone had said in the Oct. 3 hearing: "The answer to the first question would be either 'yes' or 'no': 'Do you have any knowledge of the credit-card scheme?' We assume the answer is 'yes,' only because if it is 'no,' we go no further; Mr. Greenspan goes home."

Small instead demanded that Greenspan return and appear again before the Grand Jury. His attorneys again moved to quash the subpoena, or at least to limit it to credit-card matters. Mazzone summarily denied the motion on the morning of Oct. 22. When Greenspan went back in front of the Grand Jury, Small produced a list with names and phone numbers stolen out of the offices of Campaigner Publications. When he started asking about names on the list, Greenspan asked the Grand Jury foreman if he could be excused to consult his attorney, and go to the judge for a ruling on the relevance of such questions. The foreman excused him.

About-face by Mazzone

When they got in front of Mazzone, Mazzone abruptly said, "I'm not convinced that this gentleman has ever purged himself of contempt. I've never seen a motion or heard that he has purged himself"—an outright lie on Mazzone's part, since the motion filed that morning by Greenspan's attorney had stated that Greenspan had answered the three questions which were subject of the original contempt. Mazzone then ordered Greenspan into the custody of the federal marshals, despite the protestations of Greenspan's attorney that Greenspan had purged himself of contempt two weeks earlier.

Greenspan was sent to the Essex County jail in Lawrence, Massachusetts, an ancient, filthy, overcrowded facility where he was forced to sleep on the floor in freezing temperatures, without heat, for the first night. (On the second night, after numerous inquiries from Greenspan's supporters and the press, heat and cots were provided.)

At a hearing on a "motion for reconsideration" on Oct. 23, Mazzone stated disingenuously that all that was needed was a formal motion to purge Greenspan of contempt, which could be brought to him the next morning, since "it is not my intention to keep this witness in jail." Although such a motion was presented early in the morning on Oct. 24, Mazzone's office did not issue the Order of Release until late that afternoon, forcing Greenspan to remain in custody until the end of the Grand Jury session on that day.

Observers believe that this whole scenario was orchestrated by Mazzone with Weld's office to keep the maximum physical and psychological pressure on Greenspan. It is not irrelevant that, on Oct. 21, the evening before Greenspan's appearance, a reliable intelligence community source stated that Greenspan would be jailed the following day.

The normal procedure on contempt is that, if a witness refuses to answer a question put to him by a prosecutor, he is ordered by the foreman to answer. If he refuses again, he is taken before a judge. If he refuses a direct order from the judge to answer, he is then held in contempt. Greenspan had not refused to answer any questions, but was still jailed—thus tending to confirm that the jailing was strictly a terror tactic aimed at intimidating both Greenspan and other future witnesses—the type of behavior for which Weld has become famous.

Treason in America

The history of the Bank of Boston

by Anton Chaitkin

Earlier this year, the First National Bank of Boston was caught "laundering" over a billion dollars of organized criminal money to Switzerland. It was fined only one-half million dollars, thanks to a friendly U.S. Attorney, William Weld. Today, without the necessary general crackdown against the Bank of Boston and other offenders, dope money from the world narcotics syndicate continues to pour through "respectable" channels into and through their Swiss haven.

Since the consequences of such criminal activities are so terrible to the community—starting with drug addiction and violent crime, and running through AIDS—one might be tempted to ask, don't such bankers feel themselves a part of the community? In the character of an answer, we will provide in this space some historical information that may throw light on the attitude of the Bank of Boston and its sponsors toward the United States of America.

I. Start-up money

The Bank of Boston (originally named Massachusetts Bank) was founded in 1784 by "Old Judge" John Lowell. The founder's Tory sympathies were flagrant: He was the lawyer and business agent for the most important of the Royal officials and Tory hangers-on who had gone into exile in England at the end of the American Revolution. The fortune that Lowell and his family incorporated into their bank came primarily from funds sent to the United States for investment by his Tory exiles, and from those of their family members who had remained in the United States.

The Bank's Tory associations are well-known history in Boston. But let us look closer at the actual origin of the Bank's deposits and capital.

Probably the most notorious of Lowell's client-families was the Loring clan. Insofar as a chunk of the Bank of Boston start-up money came from them, the *terrible sufferings* caused to Americans in the accumulation of this money will be seen to be relevant to the question under consideration.