

jamin Franklin House, that it was a book publishing firm, and a number of titles, which I had written, were published by New Benjamin Franklin House, particularly during that period, a dozen or more titles.

As a result of this, some friend of mine thought I ought to have an income, and they approached New Benjamin Franklin House with the idea that New Benjamin Franklin House would pay me some royalties or equivalent compensation, as an author, for books that had been published and sold by New Benjamin Franklin, and an agreement, proposal, was made to that effect, which I accepted.

However, New Benjamin Franklin House was unable to meet that requirement.

The point is, an agreement was made that, which I agreed to, that they would pay me royalties.

They found themselves unable to do so because of their financial situation and, therefore, they didn't.

And I said, fine, you can't pay it, don't, I don't ask you for it.

Q: Did you have any similar—

Ms. CARDI: Can we have a date?

THE COURT: A date, please?

A: Well, the date of which this transaction occurred would be approximately November of 1979.

Somewhere approximately February, March of 1980, and after, it became apparent to me they would never be able to issue a check, and therefore, I simply said, forget it.

Q: Did you have a similar relationship, I'm not talking about in terms of the economics, but in terms of work you did for CPI, Campaigner Publications, Inc.?

A: Campaigner Publications, I had a much more active relationship.

I am informed by legal counsel, who researched this matter thoroughly, that I was, for a number of years, a non-paid employee of Campaigner Employees.

It was largely a publishing enterprise, which maintained international news services, had editorial and publication control over a number of periodicals, literary items and over some other literary items which were published and circulated, pamphlets, that I was a resource.

Q: Speak up a little louder.

A: I was a resource for Campaigner Publications.

I wrote for them, I gave them technical advice on matters of intelligence, international intelligence, strategic intelligence, economic matters and so forth.

Q: Do you—can you tell us what the NCLC was during the years between 1976 and 1986?

A: Largely it was a—

Q: I'm sorry, 1978.

A: It had undergone a change.

Q: First of all, can you tell us what it was?

A: It was formed because of our opposition—let me scratch that and take it back, keep the answer simple.

At Columbia University, a group of people who were

FBI man trashed documents

The Aug. 18 court session at the New York "Get LaRouche" trial was enlivened when FBI Special Agent Richard J. Egan of Boston appeared as a witness, subpoenaed by defense attorney Mayer Morganroth, and ordered to testify by a federal judge. Egan was called to testify to his destruction, on May 9, 1989, of financial documents belonging to Campaigner and CDI—two of the three LaRouche-related companies named in the New York indictment. The defense asserts that the documents destroyed included many, perhaps thousands, of loan repayment checks issued by regional offices of those companies.

Charged in this case are George Canning, Marielle Kronberg, Robert Primack, and Lynne Speed, on trial for one count each of conspiracy and one of scheme to defraud. The prosecution claims the four took loans for LaRouche-related companies with no intention to repay them. In fact, as the defense argues, circumstances be-

affiliated with me, in opposition to the National SDS, New Left Leadership, got into a fight with the SDA [SDS] Leadership over the issue of labor.

The left wing of SDS was anti-labor at that time.

The—our friends in SDA [SDS], and a number of them were pro-labor.

Therefore, a fight broke out at Columbia University, in which the pro-labor faction of SDS, called itself the Columbia SDA [SDS] Labor Committee. The—this spread around the country, where various other campuses and other groups formed SDS Labor Committees, echoing the same fight.

At the beginning of 1969, a meeting of various such groups was held in Philadelphia, with the idea, should we continue the existence of this relationship.

We had come into a fraternal relationship after the dissolution of SDS, which we determined should occur.

We decided that we should continue our relationship, as a kind of Federal Organization, Association, after the dissolution of SDS, which occurred soon after that.

That became known as the National Caucus of Labor

yond the control of the LaRouche movement, including a vast campaign of government harassment, made it impossible to repay all those loans.

And now, what Egan has destroyed is hard evidence of large numbers of loan repayments to lenders!

Not only that. As became clear to the jury while Egan was on the stand, he destroyed those documents about 20 hours after an on-record, in-court stipulation, made in his presence by Assistant U.S. Attorney John Markham before federal Judge Robert Keeton in Boston, that Egan would preserve these and other documents related to aspects of the LaRouche movement—documents which the government possessed—in order to return them to representatives of the LaRouche-related companies in question. Moreover, the destruction occurred a month after the start of the New York trial, and *after* the defense team in New York had requested the documents for the trial.

According to Egan, even though he had attended the May 8 hearing before Judge Keeton as part of his job (Egan was responsible for the disposition of the documents, which the government had retained for four years for use in the Boston “LaRouche” case, which was eventually dismissed), he didn’t hear, or couldn’t recall, or was out of the room during any statement concerning preservation of the documents.

Egan remembered defense attorney Odin Anderson making some remarks at that hearing to the effect that “Agent Egan has a very fertile imagination, and might play some games . . . something might go in the furnace”; but he somehow lost his hearing halfway through the sen-

tence in which Anderson asserted that Slade Dabney, an attorney representing the bankruptcy trustees for Campaigner and CDI, had agreed to take possession of the documents on behalf of the defendants. (The federal government forced Campaigner and CDI into involuntary bankruptcy in April 1987.)

Egan testified that he heard the sentence up through the words “Slade Dabney,” but didn’t know who or what (or where) that was, became confused, and could not recall the rest of the sentence—namely, that Dabney was the authorized recipient of documents from Campaigner and CDI. And apparently, Anderson’s representation to Judge Keeton that Egan might destroy the documents made so little impression on Egan that he didn’t pay attention to what he was *supposed* to do with the documents!

Next morning, Egan says, he arrived at the Boston Federal Courthouse, and informed AUSA Markham (in a way Egan called “plainly ambiguous”) that representatives of Independent Democrats for LaRouche, The LaRouche Campaign, and the National Democratic Policy Committee had arrived for records of those organizations, and “I’m going upstairs to get rid of them.” He said he wasn’t sure how Markham interpreted that, couldn’t recall Markham’s response, was not sure if he himself had said (or meant) he was going to “get rid of” the documents, or the representatives.

Sometime in the next two hours, after “protecting” those documents from “unauthorized pickup,” Egan testified that he put the boxes of Campaigner and CDI records into the trash bin.

Committees.

That was the history of the thing.

The Caucus did have some kind of membership function from about that time into say ’76, ’77.

The NCLC ceased to be, I’m not sure of the date because I was out of the country, but it ceased to be a formal membership organization at that time, ceased to have any dues, any economic attachment.

It became an informal association of light [like-] thinking philosophical people, and so, it continued. I—all right. Anything—

Q: Now, during the, and you were, and I guess still are, a member of the NCLC, is that correct?

A: The NCLC, the only formal organization in the NCLC, apart from people being members, who consider each other members, that’s that sort of thing, no formal membership, that sort, mutual consent.

But there is formed a National Committee.

National Committee people are people who are selected for this position at conventions, or conferences of the mem-

bership conference, from the ranks of the National Committee people, who are indicated to be spokesman, public spokesman for the National Committee, on matters of policy and so forth, a group is called, created, called The National Executive Committee, which is generally people who meet together more frequently than the National Committee members meet.

Of that National Executive Committee, I have been repeated[ly] elected, nominated, elected Chairman.

Q: Now, during the years 1970—1978 through 1986, can you tell us approximately how much time you spent in this country?

A: During that period, approximately half of each calendar year, on the average.

It might vary from year to year.

Q: And the time that you were out of this country, can you tell us what you were doing?

A: I was traveling primarily in Europe, South and Central America, Asia, various countries in areas, which would include in European countries in Belgium, Denmark, touch-