

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

an Assistant U.S. Attorney in Hartford, and a former Attorney General of the United States, Herbert Brownell, in framing her approach to getting her money back. Mrs. Sexton was also made to reveal that she had received newspapers with regular coverage of financial warfare against CDI, and that she had discussed the fragility of the U.S. banking system frequently with Joyce Rubinstein, the fundraiser who organized her to give her loans. She denied, however, that this discussion had anything to do with Rubinstein telling her that her money was safer with CDI than in a bank.

The government's next witness, Lita Witt, an elderly lady from Texas who lent more than \$10,000 for the publication of the book *Dope, Inc.* in 1985, told the jury that she didn't believe the defendants lied when they said she would get her money back.

"I don't lie. I don't think they lied," the witness said under cross-examination by Michael Billington's attorney, Jim Clark, on the question of how she thought her loan would be repaid. Miss Witt said that she expected the loan would be repaid out of revenues from the book, which has already shown itself to be a rapid seller. While incredibly asserting that she, as a *New Solidarity* subscriber, didn't know of the political harassment against the book, and that it was strictly an investment, Ms. Witt nonetheless expressed her expectation that Anita Gallagher and CDI had solicited the money in good faith.

Miss Witt also supported the defense's contention that the wave of harassment following the Illinois primary had a chilling effect on potential lenders, by saying that she ran into the adverse publicity after that primary. If she had seen such publicity before she gave the loan, she said, she never would have given it.

Anti-LaRouche cabal members hit the stand

Integral to the federal government's case against Lyndon LaRouche and six associates, is to portray the philosophical association, the National Caucus of Labor Committees (NCLC), as a criminal conspiracy run by the "authoritarian personality" LaRouche. To accomplish this aim, the government has called upon a cabal of former NCLC members who have committed themselves to making up any lie necessary, in order to convict LaRouche.

Two members of this cabal, Vera Cronk and Charles Tate, took the stand for the government during the second and third days of the *USA v. LaRouche* trial. Others, including Steven Bardwell and Criton Zoakos, are expected to appear at a later date.

Under examination by the government, both Cronk and Tate were led to present an image of LaRouche as an "autocrat." Tate, who admitted later to having been coached cu-

mulatively for nearly two weeks, appears to be vying for the role of being the government's star witness. As well as giving fictional accounts of how LaRouche lives, and lying that there are no security threats against him, Tate claimed to have heard several statements by defendants LaRouche, Spannaus, and Wertz, which "proved" that they did not intend to pay back loans.

Under cross-examination, both witnesses were shown to be enraged and biased against the defendants. This was nowhere more evident than at the conclusion of cross-examination by LaRouche's attorney Odin Anderson of Miss Cronk. "In your heart, you harbor a deep antipathy to my client, don't you?" Anderson asked. Cronk, already deep red in rage and embarrassment, sat silent, unable to answer, until eventually Anderson said he withdrew the question—"she has answered it by her silence."

Tate, also under examination by Anderson, admitted that he felt every hostile emotion but hatred itself against the defendants: disdain, hostility, rage, and anger. He later agreed that he had often been the butt of jokes, because of such things as his inability to get out of bed in the morning, and in to work on time. When recounting this, Tate could hardly control himself, adding that he had been ridiculed for not getting married. Why, LaRouche had even said that he "was the most psychologically blocked person he ever met!" This outburst resulted in a wave of laughter, ranging from Judge Bryan to the audience, to members of the jury.

So now you want to give it back? Anderson asked with his concluding question. Tate, like Cronk before him, sat silently without answering.

Blatant lies

Both Tate and Cronk are known to have been involved in the planning session to "get LaRouche" which occurred at a Halloween Party held at the home of Steve and Gail Bardwell, in October 1986. This cabal was shown in the Boston federal trial against LaRouche—which ended in mistrial in May of 1988—to have been a close-knit grouping, unified by their animosity to the NCLC. In reality, the grouping was brought together by known FBI collaborator Kostas Kalintgis, and was unified, among other things, by support for Soviet positions, against attacks by LaRouche and the NCLC.

Both Tate and Cronk were shown and asked about the invitation which they received to the Halloween Party, characterized by the defense attorneys as a party to "celebrate" the recent raid against LaRouche associates, and to "mock" the NCLC. The invitation features games for the participants, including "Pin the Rap on LaRouche!" This game called for testimony from each participant on "the most serious crime committed by L. LaRouche." With the invitation in front of them, Tate and Cronk both claimed never to have seen more of the invitation than the directions to the party's location. Tate did admit that he put on a mocking skit of LaRouche—but denied the purpose of the gathering as a whole.