

LaRouche asks dismissal of 'outrageous' indictment

Attorneys for presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche filed multiple motions in Boston federal court on Aug. 14, seeking dismissal of the indictment brought against him on June 30, 1987.

While at least 24 separate motions were filed, the major motion charges that LaRouche has been targeted for legal harassment under "national security" provisions for almost 20 years, in a politically motivated campaign by his enemies in the government. LaRouche further argues that the indictment against him, one count of "conspiracy to obstruct justice," is a product of unconstitutional techniques directed against him and his associates under provisions of Executive Order 12333, the current guideline for foreign intelligence and counterintelligence activities.

LaRouche, his two 1984 presidential campaign committees, three other organizations, and 13 of his associates are presently scheduled to go on trial in Boston on Sept. 21, 1987, on charges of credit card fraud and conspiracy to obstruct justice. Substantial pretrial questions remain to be decided, including suppression of part of the search conducted by federal authorities, and the question of grand jury abuse.

In addition, the government has initiated new collateral actions in its overall attempt to shut down LaRouche's presidential campaign, and organizations associated with his policies, before trial. These include the collection of a bogus judgment for "contempt" from the National Democratic Policy Committee, on Aug. 18, and a campaign of demanding testimony from American witnesses in West Germany, in order to avoid providing them with their U.S. constitutional rights.

Taken as a whole, the motions, and memorandum of facts, provide the evidence to put the government on trial, for illegal and outrageous prosecutorial abuse. In what follows, *EIR* publishes the bulk of the memorandum of supporting facts, which presents the case for government misconduct. In future issues, we will publish the memorandum detailing a pattern of similar misconduct in the creation of

"credit card fraud" charges against LaRouche's political associates.

Memorandum in support of motion of Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. to dismiss indictment

Statement of facts

A.—BACKGROUND

From the inception of the official investigation in this case and long before, the principal target of the investigation has been Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. As will be developed in this factual proffer, LaRouche has been the target of investigation and indictment for reasons other than criminal activity. Rather, the motive governing this investigation and the repeated pretextual investigations of LaRouche over a 19-year period is impermissible under the U.S. Constitution: it is to eliminate a political figure and associated political organizations from the American and international political landscape because they, in the exercise of their Constitutional rights, represent a perceived threat to existing institutions and power structures.

One of the clearest statements demonstrating this motive is found in a 1973 FBI document. The document, annexed as Exhibit 1, demonstrates that: in 1973, the FBI obtained knowledge of discussions within the Communist Party USA about "eliminating" LaRouche and the threat of the NCLC. The FBI took no steps to prevent this or even to warn LaRouche of the threat. Rather, the FBI's NCLC case agent gloated: "it is felt that if the subject [LaRouche] was no longer in control of NCLC operations that the NCLC would fall apart with internal strife and conflict."

As is fully set forth in Exhibit 2, the government's actions against LaRouche have historically been premised on "national security" grounds. The "national security" predicate for investigation has allowed the employment of extraordinary and secret investigative techniques which have been

found to be otherwise constitutionally repugnant and impermissible. (See Exhibit 2.)

The government's domestic security investigation of LaRouche involved a program of selective prosecution under the state and local statutes, a government-fed "black propaganda" campaign featuring publication of derogatory information in national news outlets, and government monitoring and interference with the finances of publishers of LaRouche's writings. The United States government characterizations of LaRouche and his activities as "national security" threats was widely disseminated abroad, to the deliberate damage of foreign policy initiatives undertaken by LaRouche and his associates.

Information developed in the course of such "pretext" criminal investigations and in the course of unlawful national security investigations has been utilized, in turn, to isolate and harass political supporters of LaRouche and to neutralize his political influence through both direct and indirect means.

In 1977, the "domestic national security investigation" of LaRouche described in Exhibit 2 was "officially" ended without an indictment. The immediate outcome of the Church and Pike Committee hearings on intelligence activities was a prohibition, under domestic security guidelines and on constitutional grounds, of the types of activities conducted against LaRouche and his associates during the 1968-1977 period. While there is evidence that the government continued its activities against LaRouche under the FBI's foreign counterintelligence guidelines and policies and procedures of other agencies, the predication for events immediately material to the present indictment begins in 1981 with the signing of Executive Order 12333 by President Reagan. . . .

In 1982, defendant believes, the national security investigation of LaRouche was re-initiated. This investigation was conducted under the terms of Executive Order 12333. One known predication for the investigation was the deliberate falsehood that LaRouche and his associates were acting as agents of foreign influence. (See Exhibits 4 and 5, *infra*.) This conceptualization took various forms, but with the same desired effect—to trigger and justify activities under Executive Order 12333.

Unredacted sections of an FBI letter evidencing this investigation, dated September 24, 1982 and concerning "Lyndon LaRouche and the *Executive Intelligence Review*," state that it is the FBI's conclusion that many of NCLC's activities "are often propitious to Soviet disinformation and propaganda interests." The letter further states:

there is no firm evidence that the Soviets are directing or funding LaRouche or his organization. It is entirely plausible, however, that the Soviets have developed and may be developing sources within the NCLC who are in a position to interject Soviet inspired views into

NCLC activities and publications. It is likely that the Soviets will attempt to capitalize on or exploit NCLC sentiments. . . .

(See Exhibit 4.) The author of this letter was James E. Nolan, the Director at that time of FBI Foreign Counterintelligence. Such a characterization could not be espoused at this level without having the desired causal effect.

On January 12, 1983, FBI Director William H. Webster wrote a letter to Oliver Revell which stated in pertinent part:

At the PFIAB meeting today, David Abshire raised the subject of the activities of the U.S. Labor Party and Lyndon LaRouche. . . . [He] wondered whether the FBI had a basis for investigating these activities under the guidelines *or otherwise*. A number of the members present, including Edward Bennett Williams, raised the question of *the sources of funding* for these U.S. Labor Party activities. In view of the large amounts obviously being expended worldwide, the question was raised whether the U.S. Labor Party might *be funded* by hostile intelligence agencies. . . .(Exhibit 5, emphasis supplied).

Under combined Executive Orders 12331, 12333 and 12334, the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board ("PFIAB") is a controlling agency over the activities of the President's Intelligence Oversight Board, the legal auditor of special and covert operations undertaken by the intelligence community. Again, such a characterization could not be imposed without having the desired causal effect.

Despite the obvious spoor, it was unclear, as top secret covert operations are intended to be, whether a national security operation was under foot and controlling the environment.

On July 17, 1987 defendant Paul Goldstein received a response to an FOIA request asking for documents pertaining to either any foreign counterintelligence or related investigation or electronic surveillance of several named individuals and organizations. The National Security Agency responded that it had such documents pertaining to the Schiller Institute. (Exhibit 6.) The Federal Bureau of Investigation also responded that it had such documents pertaining to the Schiller Institute.

The Schiller Institute is an international public affairs organization founded by LaRouche's wife, Helga Zepp LaRouche, and in which Mr. LaRouche and other defendants have been extremely active participants. It was founded in the summer of 1984 and began extensive activities in the fall of 1984, simultaneous with the launching of the instant criminal investigation. The Schiller Institute is named in the search warrant executed in this case, and was a subject in the grand jury investigation and other investigations leading to this indictment. It has been a primary proponent of

LaRouche's economic, defense and foreign policy initiatives in Latin America, Asia, Western Europe and the United States. It has also been a primary opponent of the Reagan administration's Contra policies. While the Schiller Institute is not a defendant herein, it continues to be a focus of interest to the "intelligence community" in general and to the prosecution in the instant case in particular. As recently as August 11, 1987 AUSA [Assistant U.S. Attorney] Rasch and FBI Agent Egan were in West Germany asking questions regarding, *inter alia*, the Schiller Institute.

To LaRouche's knowledge, individuals responsible for the circulation of the fabrication that he is a "Soviet disinformation agent," in addition to the FBI and the Department of Justice, include Roy Godson, individuals associated with the AFL-CIO, including Tom Kahn, Herbert Rommerstein [sic] of the U.S. Information Agency, John Rees, sections of the ADL, individuals associated with the League for Industrial Democracy, the Heritage Foundation, John Norton Moore (consultant to the Intelligence Oversight Board), Robert McBrien (Deputy for Security Affairs, and Crisis Management, Department of Treasury), and Don Jameson, a former CIA official and a partner of Ted Shackley.

Many of these individuals functioned as informants to the FBI in the 1968-1977 COINTELPRO investigation of LaRouche while conducting private hostile actions against LaRouche, and coordinating these activities with the FBI. Each is an active opponent of LaRouche's political policies and upon information and belief is a private member of the U.S. Intelligence Community as authorized and approved by Executive Order 12333. Collectively, these individuals represent an identifiable faction within the U.S. intelligence community which also incorporates the Justice Department's Office of Special Investigations and Deputy Attorney General Mark Richard. The activities of many of these individuals have been the subject of recent Congressional investigation and are, upon information and belief, the focus of investigations by Special Prosecutor Lawrence Walsh. These individuals played prominent roles in the Reagan administration's "contra" program, a program which the defendant adamantly opposed.

During the 1984 Presidential campaign, the most visible of the operations of this grouping against LaRouche were in the preparation and dissemination of an NBC Television News Broadcast, "First Camera." That broadcast attempted to "expose" LaRouche's relationship with the Reagan administration and the Intelligence Community. The FBI, the CIA, and the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) provided primary information for that broadcast, as did many of the individuals involved in the defamatory characterization that LaRouche was a Soviet disinformation agent. (Exhibit 7.) The NBC broadcast called for a full-scale government investigation of "LaRouche's finances." The reporter for that

broadcast, Pat Lynch, continued to collaborate in U.S. Attorney Weld's investigation and with the FBI. An article published in the *Wall Street Journal* by reporter Lynch and Dennis King, in fact, provides a roadmap to the government's initial investigation in this case and is usefully compared with the government's search warrant affidavit. (Exhibit 8.)

U.S. Attorney Weld opened the present investigation by publication through NBC affiliate WBZ in Boston during LaRouche's libel case against NBC in Alexandria, Virginia. In the fall of 1984, LaRouche was warned by sources within the Intelligence Community that Oliver Revell, the FBI, elements of the CIA and the National Security Council and various private operatives were about to undertake a major offensive against him, the purpose of which would be to permanently eliminate his political influence. Events since that warning speak for themselves.

In addition to the derogatory propaganda campaign represented by the First Camera broadcast, other aspects of the investigation immediately leading to the present indictment parallel the illegal activities formerly denominated under the rubric "COINTELPRO" and justified by the government on national security grounds.

The United States, throughout the course of the instant investigation, has stated its public intention to bankrupt political organizations and associations associated with LaRouche. Various leaks of derogatory, defamatory and scandalous materials have been made to the national news media for the sole purpose of destroying the financial operation of the defendant entities and organizations in this case. (See Exhibit 9.) When these tactics failed to contain popular support for LaRouche's policies, the United States ultimately took the extraordinary step of involuntarily bankrupting two corporate defendants in this case. The unprecedented nature and effect of this action demonstrates with crystal clarity the level of vituperation existent within the Justice Department and the extent to which they are willing to go to bring down LaRouche and his colleagues.

Simultaneously, the government has utilized political supporter and contact lists obtained in the course of the criminal investigation to subject these individuals to repeated harassment and interrogation by various government agents. In addition, the government has utilized this investigation and the parallel national security investigation to identify, isolate, and neutralize U.S. and foreign governmental officials who had collaborated with LaRouche. The government has and is acting to end all such relationships as is demonstrated by its repeated assertions that LaRouche represents interests inconsistent with the national interest. These assertions have the additional, and equally significant function, of serving as the triggers for operating under Executive Order 12333, et al.

Associates of defendant have been subjected to multiple

state prosecutions under novel and selective legal theories with the full knowledge and participation of the U.S. government and the prosecution in this case. According to state prosecutive theories, the taking of a loan evidenced by a promissory note by a political organization is the sale of a "security" and failure to register as a dealer in such "securities" is a violation of state criminal statute.

The full implications of the parallel national security investigation to this case are not presently known. Based on the available evidence, however, LaRouche is able to point to the following:

1.—Under the present terms of Executive Order 12333 and 12334, it is possible for the Government to refuse to disclose or to falsely deny the relationship between the Government and Roy Frankhauser or Forrest Lee Fick. The government states that Frankhauser and Fick falsely claimed to work for the CIA and that LaRouche believed them. The Government's own case is that Frankhauser and Fick initiated the "conspiracy to obstruct justice," and much of the government's evidence centers on statements attributed to Frankhauser and Fick.

2.—The PFIAB memo cited above indicates a full counterintelligence investigation of LaRouche and all sources of funding directly or indirectly involving him. The techniques employed in such an investigation are secret under the FBI's counterintelligence guidelines and under Executive Order 12333. There has been discussion in the intelligence community to the effect that such techniques involve "neutralization" of a counterintelligence target. (See Exhibit 3.)

Investigative techniques authorized on national security grounds include warrantless searches, break-ins, and penetrations of political organizations by government agents and sting operatives. LaRouche does not know to what extent information unlawfully derived from the national security investigation was utilized in the criminal investigation, or the extent to which the national security investigation was utilized to justify otherwise unconstitutional and unlawful techniques in the course of the criminal investigation.

3.—In February of 1986, the FBI held what has been described as a "mass meeting" in Boston to launch new investigative strategies. At this point, according to the court testimony of participants, U.S. Attorney Weld was seeking a national tax investigation of LaRouche and his associates. U.S. Attorney Weld's approach was rejected by conference participants according to their testimony. The remarks attributed to Weld by the January 1986 FBI memorandum announcing this conference demonstrate that as of that time and despite the dramatic escalation of the Boston investigation, Weld had no case against LaRouche except for the original WBZ television allegations against volunteers working in the Boston office of the campaign prior to November 1984. Weld was concerned, however, that "the fundraising continues." (See Exhibit 11.)

In March of 1986, however, two associates of LaRouche won Democratic primary elections in Illinois. The spate of panicked media coverage which followed featured prominent disclosures from the Boston grand jury investigation in an attempt to discredit LaRouche and his associates. In April of 1986, Forrest Lee Fick presented himself to NBC television in a wild national broadcast in which he purported to "expose" LaRouche and Paul Goldstein in violent activities. Fick became the government's lead witness against LaRouche and his associates in or about June of 1986, resulting in the re-initiation of grand jury proceedings.

William Weld has a demonstrated personal animosity and malice toward LaRouche. His business records demonstrate he was a funder of the *Real Paper* in Boston, a left-liberal publication active in harassment of LaRouche and his parents during the 1970s. LaRouche was also highly critical of Weld's conduct of the money-laundering case against the Bank of Boston.

LaRouche charged that in a case involving offenses totaling \$1.2 billion, the Bank of Boston and its officers had escaped with a "slap on the wrist" fine. Political associates of LaRouche charged that U.S. Attorney Weld's family interests, White Weld, were closely connected in the agencies involved in the money-laundering crimes at issue in the case. The U.S. Department of the Treasury, following investigative reasoning also formulated by LaRouche, discovered that the New England region represented an outstanding concentration of the types of irregularities in banking transactions associated with drug money laundering. This view of the significance of the Bank of Boston case was expressed publicly by Assistant Secretary of the Treasury John Walker. Associates of LaRouche in widely circulated fliers throughout the Boston area questioned the propriety of Weld's handling of the Bank of Boston case. Weld's personal animosity toward LaRouche has been cited in public news accounts. For example, the October 7, 1986 *Washington Post* carried the following statement:

In late spring of this year, awaiting confirmation by Congress, Weld galvanized Justice and FBI officials in Washington, sources said. He demanded action from the U.S. Attorney's office in Alexandria, which had been relatively inactive on the LaRouche investigation, according to the sources.

"Weld just threw a hand grenade into the Department of Justice," one law enforcement source said. The feeling was, "Let's hit them."

As previously indicated, certain of LaRouche's editorial and policy positions were used by his antagonists as the ostensible basis for the pro-Soviet and disinformation characterizations they were espousing. In fact, LaRouche and the Reagan administration had substantial and fundamental policy differences which provided an additional incentive

for operations against him and his colleagues.

Although LaRouche was helpful to the National Security Council in developing and promoting what became known as the strategic defense initiative (SDI), and also helpful to the Reagan administration in other matters, there are areas of very sharp political differences, including the issue of "Contra" policy, in which LaRouche has been a significant adversary of the administration's strongly asserted commitments to policy:

1.—The most general conflict with the administration, especially since April 1983, has been on the matter of national and foreign monetary and economic policies. This is defined by a document presented to the administration during the first week of August 1982, entitled "Operation Juarez," outlining emergency actions to be taken in response to an imminent outbreak of an international debt-payments crisis. Probable actions against LaRouche under Executive Order 12333 guidelines are dated from September and October of 1982.

In this vein, before and after the interval of August-October 1982, LaRouche has been an opponent of the Reagan administration's continuation of Federal Reserve System policies, the so-called "Volcker Policies," which Federal Reserve Chairman Paul A. Volcker himself once accurately described as "controlled disintegration of the economy."

LaRouche has also opposed strongly the administration's support for what are known as "IMF conditionalities." LaRouche has made three characterizations of U.S. support for such "conditionalities":

(a) That they constitute immoral usury, contributing to the general misery and accelerated mortality rates of nations subjected to these conditions, and are thus actions tantamount to crimes against humanity.

(b) That they do not solve the financial crisis confronting the U.S., but merely worsen the crisis by means used to postpone it, threatening the national financial bankruptcy of the U.S. banking system and other institutions.

(c) That the effects of such "conditionalities" include great strategic advantage to the U.S.'s avowed principal adversary, the Russian empire under its present Bolshevik Dynasty.

It is LaRouche's information and belief that these economic and financial issues are the principal motive for the politically-motivated, covertly directed legal harassment of himself and persons associated with him supporting his own financial and economic policies.

2.—LaRouche has strongly opposed a dogma circulated influentially within the Reagan administration since mid-1983, the dogma that the Russian Empire of today is a "crumbling empire." LaRouche has insisted that the contrary is true, and that U.S. policies premised on assumptions of the "crumbling empire" dogma tend toward concessions to the Soviet Government which could be at least as disastrous as the Chamberlain-Daladier Agreements with Hitler at

Munich, during 1938.

For this and other reasons, LaRouche has strongly opposed the President's stated commitment to negotiating the so-called "Zero Option" Agreement with Moscow.

3.—LaRouche has held up to international ridicule the President's repeated assertion that, since approximately April 1983, the U.S. economy has been in an economic upsurge.

4.—LaRouche has strongly opposed the official policy of the Reagan administration on assessment and policy respecting the so-called AIDS Pandemic.

5.—LaRouche, while actively supporting actions taken by the administration against the drug-traffic, has characterized the Reagan administration's war on drugs and policy toward international narco-terrorism as token, inconsistent, vacillating, and ineffective.

6.—LaRouche strongly disapproved of the appointment of Richard Burt as U.S. Ambassador to West Germany, arguing that the effect could be catastrophic in its tendency to contribute to decoupling of military alliance between the two States.

7.—LaRouche strongly opposed and has denounced the Reagan administration's orchestration of the overthrow of the government of Philippines President Marcos as an obnoxious folly fostering the destabilization of the U.S. strategic position in the Pacific Basin. LaRouche opposes a similar effort by elements of the U.S. intelligence community to mobilize an insurrection in Panama.

8.—LaRouche has denounced the U.S. Intelligence Community for attempting to conceal drug-running activities of the Contras, in the face of legal evidence that operations coordinated by Lt. Col. North were assisting in the transit of such drugs into the U.S.A.

9.—LaRouche has denounced complicit elements of the U.S. Intelligence Community, including the ADL and the Office of Senator Jesse Helms, for their continued political assistance to the terrorist gang which claimed credit for the assassination of the defendant's personal friend, India's Prime Minister Indira Gandhi.

LaRouche's opposition to the administration's "Contra" policy brought him into sharp conflict with an individual named "Nat," who represented himself as the Intelligence Community controller of Forrest Lee Fick. Prior to Fick's appearance on NBC and role as a Government witness, "Nat" and Fick solicited LaRouche's support of the Contra effort, allegedly requesting such support on behalf of the Intelligence Community. LaRouche refused this entreaty. Many of the individuals who privately funded the Contra effort were also financial supporters of LaRouche. It is LaRouche's information and belief that his associates successfully dissuaded these individuals from providing sums requested by Lt. Col. North's fundraisers, including "Spitz" Channell and Roy Godson.

These and related political differences between the President's Intelligence Community and LaRouche are promi-

ment among the Intelligence Community's apparent motive for the vindictive targeting of LaRouche for legal harassment.

B.—THE WIRE AND MAIL FRAUD CHARGES

[Large section omitted here—Ed.]

C.—THE CONSPIRACY TO OBSTRUCT JUSTICE CHARGE

The conspiracy to obstruct charge in the indictment is obviously primarily derived from the testimony of Forrest Lee Fick. The charge against the defendant is constructed as follows:

1.—In late November, 1984, and again in early December 1984, Fick and Roy Frankhauser caused to be written and transmitted to the defendant and others a so-called COMSTA-C report, in which words are used which are presently construed by the government to represent Fick's efforts to initiate a conspiracy to obstruct justice. It is indicated that Fick has reported this, *ex post facto*, to have been his intent.

2.—Fick alleged that LaRouche orally adopted Fick's recommendation to enter into a conspiracy to obstruct justice.

3.—The government has chosen to create entire sentences from isolated words taken from selected notebook entries of third persons, and to construct those fictitious sentences as statements allegedly issued from the defendant's lips. The government represents this construction as an interpretation of isolated words based on the allegations of the same Fick. According to the government, this construction, taken from notebooks, corroborates the statements of Fick.

4.—As LaRouche testified to the Grand Jury, the suggestions by Fick to enter into a conspiracy to obstruct justice were completely repudiated by LaRouche.

The construction of the government's charge is thus primarily premised on the credibility of Fick, who, the government has simultaneously stated, lied to the defendants when he stated he was associated with the Central Intelligence Agency and the U.S. intelligence community.

Fick's relationship to LaRouche is admitted by the government to be based on Fick's representation of himself as a private member of the U.S. Intelligence Community, in a manner consistent with the specifications of Executive Order 12333. Fick associated himself with Roy Frankhauser during 1982 until the Spring of 1985. It is LaRouche's information and belief that Frankhauser has been a member and asset of the CIA and the intelligence community as defined by Executive Order 12333, during and prior to the period of events alleged in the indictment. It is LaRouche's further information and belief that a false denial of the fact of Frankhauser's status, as re-enforced by the sworn testimony of Lt. Col. Oliver North in the recent Congressional hearings, reflects a standard practice of lying by the intelligence community under the terms of Executive Order 12333.

While there is other evidence of Frankhauser's intelli-

gence community status, the bona fides of Fick and Frankhauser were represented to defendant by an individual introduced to defendant under the pseudonym "Nat." It is LaRouche's information and belief that "Nat" was and is a well-known, high-ranking official of the Central Intelligence Agency, in the covert operations directorate.* Nat represented himself to LaRouche as the intelligence community controller of Fick, further inducing LaRouche to believe that information, advice and recommendations passed through Fick and Frankhauser were coming from the CIA and the intelligence community as defined under Executive Order 12333. Thus, the government, through its covert agents, made recommendations to LaRouche and his associates, and is now using those very recommendations as evidence of obstruction of justice.

During 1986, Nat and Fick had attempted to secure LaRouche's support of the Reagan administration's Contra policy in Central America. Following Fick's dismissal as a security guard for a company providing security services for LaRouche, Fick entered into collaboration with NBC-TV and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith in a defamatory campaign against LaRouche, and appeared on an NBC broadcast, making allegations that LaRouche and Paul Goldstein engaged in violent plots against public officials. It is significant that immediately prior to his severance, Fick admitted association and collaboration with Jimmy Rosenberg, a one-time paid agent of the ADL.

The only other claims against LaRouche in the indictment consist, again, of government constructions of a third person's notebook entries. These government constructions purport to represent LaRouche's statements about U.S. Attorney William Weld ("vicious personal attack on William Weld") and proposed legal actions concerning the grand jury investigation ("stall and appeal"). LaRouche demonstrated the complete falsity of the government's construction of these notebook entries in his testimony before the grand jury, and contends that his indictment for his actual actions and activities in exercising his First Amendment rights and seeking legal redress for an unlawful government investigation represent simple prosecutorial retaliation for the exercise of Constitutional rights.

In short, it is LaRouche's contention and belief that the case against him is not predicated on facts, but is a construction cut out of whole cloth; a construction fashioned and fabricated by elements of the "intelligence community" under Executive Order 12333 representing gross governmental misconduct to the extent that the governmental involvement in the alleged criminality has reached and passed a demonstrable level of outrageousness.

*Defendant is prepared to make an *in camera* showing with respect to the identity of "Nat" in compliance with relevant statutes relative to classified information and the identity of intelligence agents.