

fact, since 1979, they raised over \$150 million—the real context for the \$30 million in loans the government talks about. “Things would be very different today, if they were just left alone,” Gettings concluded.

Political enemies

Michael Reilly, attorney for Paul Greenberg, directly answered the question in the *U.S.A. v. LaRouche* case as to why loans were not repaid by the defendants, in his opening statement. Reilly said that the defense would show that it was a series of unexpected attacks, including by the federal government, that prevented the repayment. Other attackers named were the FBI, state officials, NBC-TV, the ADL, and the big banks.

Reilly then explained why these agencies would oppose the LaRouche political movement. First, because that movement attacked the most powerful forces in the country in an attempt to improve the country. Second, because they went after those things they considered immoral in a harsh way. And third, because the attacks began to be successful—through successes like the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) and the Illinois electoral victories.

It was this set of attacks, especially through the media, that interfered with business contracts and other sales expectations. And, in fact, the defendants said so at the time, with the letters sent out to lenders. The government, of course, says the defendants didn’t mean what they said in the letters—they just were lying because they didn’t intend to pay back the loans. But the government took every scrap of paper out of the defendants’ offices in 1986, which showed that in their most private conversations, they were discussing scrambling to repay loans, and saying they couldn’t because of the attacks on them.

In sum, this is not a case about money, as the government claims, but a case about politics. That’s why the money was raised, and how it was prevented from being repaid, Reilly concluded.

The government is lying

Attorney Odin Anderson, speaking for Lyndon LaRouche, ripped the government’s characterization of the NCLC and Lyndon LaRouche to pieces in his opening statement. Directly countering the government’s claim that the NCLC is a criminal conspiracy, and the authoritarian personality theory on which it is based, Anderson was eventually suppressed by the prosecution and the judge.

Anderson began with a discussion of LaRouche’s commitment to dedicate his life completely to his philosophical and political ideas, a life consumed with constant work. He outlined Lyn’s beginning in politics by opposing the New Left: “He tried to recruit young people who would want to save Western Civilization, not destroy it as the New Left was trying to do.” And that’s what the NCLC is all about.

But the NCLC’s dedication to the principles of industrial

progress and reform of the international financial institutions caused LaRouche and his friends some problems, Anderson continued. LaRouche went on a number of people’s hit lists. He also, of course, is on a lot of people’s Christmas Card lists, as he has won associates and friends from around the world, particularly the Third World. Anderson also detailed the C = 256 campaign in the field of music, and noted that the Soviet Union is among LaRouche’s greatest enemies.

Several lies about LaRouche were directly dispelled. First, that he was responsible for the loan policy. Instead, LaRouche said as often and as loudly as he could, that loans had to be curtailed. Second, that LaRouche wanted loans not to be repaid. To the contrary, LaRouche said as often and as loudly as he could to anyone who would listen that it was “suicide” not to pay back loans to political supporters. And the government knows it.

Anderson devoted the remainder of his remarks to attacking the government’s “ludicrous” tax conspiracy charge. LaRouche never hid his situation, Anderson first noted. Second, he lived in a situation of physical threat, arising first from the Weathermen types, then the Communist Party USA, and later the dope lobby. This created a situation where he was a guest and/or prisoner in places created to preserve his physical welfare, but not only used by him.

Anderson then attempted to counter the Marxist-based authoritarian personality theory being used by the government in portraying the NCLC as a conspiracy—which drove the prosecution into frantic objections, which were sustained by the Judge.

This case is about ideas and their suppression

Kenly Webster, attorney for Edward Spannaus, told the court in his opening statement at the *U.S.A. v. LaRouche* trial that the only reason his client was on trial, was that he was part of a political movement which powerful people wanted to suppress. The focus of this political movement was a battle for the minds of men and women, particularly on the issues of the War on Drugs, the Strategic Defense Initiative, the International Monetary Fund, AIDS, and classical culture. These were controversial ideas, Webster said, and they resulted in major attacks.

The evidence will show, he went on, that most of the defendants’ time was spent on intelligence gathering and writing. These were people devoted to spreading the ideas of their political movement.

As for Ed Spannaus, besides writing on the legislation necessary to stop drug money laundering, the American Sys-

tem of Law, "Why the Founding Fathers Rejected British Law," he also wrote on subjects attacking the government. For example, he wrote on the FBI coverup of Iranian gun-running. . .

At this point the prosecution began objecting, and Judge Bryan rushed in to argue that the case was not about the defendants' political ideas, which the government does not claim are illegitimate. When Webster went on to mention an article by Spannaus on FBI Gestapo tactics, and his civil suits against the FBI and FEC, the prosecution went wild again, and was sustained by the judge.

In sum, the government proved Webster's point, that they were trying to suppress the ideas of the defense—by seeking to prevent an exposition of those ideas.

Witness worked with FBI trying to entrap LaRouche

The prosecution's first witness in the LaRouche case was Elizabeth Sexton, a woman who lent more than \$112,800 to Caucus Distributors Inc., one of the corporations shut down by the federal government in its unprecedented *ex parte* bankruptcy proceeding in the spring of 1987.

The bulk of direct examination of Sexton, an obviously still well-to-do Connecticut Yankee, was conducted by Assistant U.S. Attorney John Markham, who prosecuted the heavily overlapping conspiracy, loan fraud, and obstruction of justice indictments against LaRouche and others in Boston which ended in a mistrial last May.

Markham took Sexton through a laborious elaboration of her loans, which were uncontested by the defense. Sexton tried hard to convey the impression that she was only interested in supporting the publication of the book *Dope, Inc.*, as a business investment, although she subscribed to publications put out by LaRouche's associates, and appeared to be a political supporter during the period in question. Sexton attempted to portray her involvement as merely a question of a high rate of interest for her loans. Yet, she never attempted to get collateral, or ascertain the credit rating of the political organization she was contributing to.

During direct examination, Sexton portrayed her actions, including personal letters to LaRouche about her loans, as simply attempts to get her money back. Under cross-examination, however, Sexton revealed that, contrary to her representations, she had secretly collaborated with the government to try to entrap the defendants.

When all the confusion about when Mrs. Sexton got in contact with the government about her CDI loans was finally cleared up, it emerged that she had written her second letter to LaRouche in June 1986 in collaboration with the government, in hopes of helping the government make its case against LaRouche. In a surprising development, while being cross-examined by LaRouche's attorney, Odin Anderson, Mrs. Sexton suddenly revealed that she had notes about exactly whom she had met among law enforcement authorities.

When questioned as to where those notes were, she admitted that they were right there in the courtroom. Pointing to a man in a dark suit sitting in the back of the courtroom, Sexton declared: "He's in charge of them." And who is he? LaRouche's attorney asked. The person in question turned out to be with the Secret Service, accompanying Sexton throughout her stay in Alexandria. A recess was then called while Mrs. Sexton's notes were produced, and eventually entered into evidence.

Through the course of her cross-examination, it also came out that, far from operating on her own, Mrs. Sexton had consulted with the former Attorney General of Connecticut,

Norbert Brainin

First Violinist
of the
Legendary Amadeus Quartet

with
Günter Ludwig
Pianist

MOZART
Sonata in G Major K. 379

SCHUMANN
Sonata No. 1 in A Minor, Op. 105

BEETHOVEN
Sonata No. 2 in C Minor, Op. 30

Friday, December 2, 1988
8 P.M.

Gaston Hall
Healy Building, 3rd Floor
Georgetown University
37th & O Sts. Washington, D.C., NW
Admission: \$15

Sponsored by: Commission to Investigate Human Rights Violations
Benefit for: Constitutional Defense Fund,
P.O. Box 2244, Upper Darby, PA 19082

For ticket information call TICKETRON:
1-800-543-3041

For additional information: 1-800-543-1462