

## Call on President Reagan to pardon LaRouche

From around the world, friends of Lyndon LaRouche are petitioning President Reagan to reverse the guilty verdict handed down by a rigged jury against LaRouche and six associates, in a political show trial in the Alexandria, Virginia federal court on Dec. 16.

Amelia Robinson, a U.S. civil rights leader and former associate of Dr. Martin Luther King, issued an appeal for a mass march on Washington to be held on Martin Luther King Day, Jan. 16. Mrs. Robinson had testified as a character witness for LaRouche during the Alexandria trial. "Today," she wrote, "people from around the world are surprised to find, that in the United States of America, the same injustice suffered by blacks is being used in the trial of the economist and political leader Lyndon LaRouche, and his co-workers. Justice has been set aside, and these people's rights have been taken away from them. . . . On behalf of all the people concerned with civil and human rights . . . we ask that Mr. LaRouche be given his civil and human rights, and that he and his associates be absolved of all charges."

Also in the United States, activists of the Food for Peace movement toured Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, and Washington, D.C. on Dec. 29, to build support for the mass demonstration and to request that government officials sign a petition to the President to pardon LaRouche.

From Kuwait, the daily *As Seyassa* headlined its coverage of the trial on Dec. 29, "International Pressure on President Reagan to Pardon LaRouche." The article described the Establishment's actions against him as "the price of American-Soviet détente." It quoted from a Dec. 16 press conference given by LaRouche, in which he warned, "The real aim is not to put me in jail, it is to kill me," and stated that the only parallels to such a case are the McCarthy period in the United States in the 1950s and

the attacks against the civil rights movement.

In Lima, Peru, the daily newspaper of the ruling APRA party, *Hoy*, published a commentary Dec. 24, emphasizing that the trial against LaRouche is "perhaps a truly political trial, unlike any before in the United States."

"From the first time we heard of LaRouche's proposals," the article continued, "we found them timely and on the mark: his proposal to get rid of the unjust financial system headed by the International Monetary Fund; he proposed solving the foreign debt problem with a moratorium plan, called 'Operation Juárez.' We could not get away from it. Since then, and even before, he made clear his committed identification with much of what was essential to the Latin Americans—political and economic sovereignty and our right to development—through his open support to the Mexican moratorium proclaimed by President José López Portillo and which could end up in the longed-for Debtors' Club. He was alone at the time in the industrialized world in supporting Argentine sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands against British colonial pretensions; his effective support for the Peruvian position on limiting debt payments and his recent support for Panama against the destabilization encouraged by the United States government, whose ultimate goal was the disavowal of the canal treaties. . . .

But that is not the only thing which makes him a 'political extremist' in the eyes of the U.S. and international financial and political Establishment: his warnings on the U.S. economic crash, which became reality with the New York Stock Exchange crash; his call to abandon the Bretton Woods system to impose a new international economic order more just with the Third World; his proposal for a defense policy for the West . . . which inspired the SDI; his alert on AIDS and its destructive potential; his call to defend the principles of Western culture. . . .

"The unusual speed with which the trial took place . . . and the fact he was declared guilty of all the charges together . . . shows that the trial was more important for those who brought it than they are willing to admit."

Hence, on this account, my frail person touches the most awesome power of this planet, a power greater than all governments, and greater than any would-be gods of Olympus. If such forces continue their efforts to exterminate the cause which I represent, their success on that account ensures their own extermination not long afterward. This power is not my personal possession; it is a power to pass final judgment upon all would-be judges, a power emanating from the Creator. It is not my hand, or that of my friends, which would destroy those who would destroy me and my friends, it is the Hand of Providence.

### This message

The first function of this message of reply is to provoke a suitable verification of the second message delivered to me, to ensure that the messenger has represented the views of those his credentials imply he does represent.

The second function, is to ensure that those principals have opportunity to reconsider their announced course, and to shape any further message to me accordingly.

The reasons for choosing this channel to make this reply, ought to be obvious to those whom the messenger represents.