Secret government moves to impose an oligarchical legal system in U.S.

by Edwin Vieira, Jr.

Mr. Vieira, an attorney in the Commonwealth of Virginia, is and expert in constitutional law and the secretary of the Fact-Finding Committee of the Commission to Investigate Human Rights Violations.

The shocking result in the LaRouche trial might, not unnaturally, tempt an observer schooled in the jurisprudence of American constitutionalism to despair that "The system has failed!" if it can inflict such a brazen insult to fair play upon a noted, though controversial, political figure. However, this conclusion would rest on a false premise: namely, that LaRouche and his associates were convicted according to the rules of *American constitutional law*. In fact, the LaRouche trial illustrates, in the very starkest outline, that *two different*—indeed, *mutually antagonistic*—forms of "law" now exist, side by side, in this country: one, the traditional system of constitutional jurisprudence known and revered from common-law times as "due process of law"; and, two, an emerging system of "oligarchical legality," composed of peculiar "crimes" and unique procedures "tailor made" for the selective convictions of certain special defendants.

Admittedly, there have always been *isolated aberrations* even in American constitutional jurisprudence—instances in which injustices occurred because individual participants in the system failed in particular instances to perform their duties as prosecutors, judges, or jurors. But, these instances were recognizable and condemnable as *in*justices precisely because they were palpable *departures* from the law: The over-zealous prosecutor who employs perjured testimony to win a case, the corrupt judge who rules out of order the defendant's exculpatory evidence, the biased jurors who find the defendant guilty because of his race and in spite of the evidence proving his innocence—all these are familiar figures in American legal history. Yet, although *familiar* in that history, they nevertheless are *foreign* to the law that is the subject of history. For the law outlaws them in principle and punishes them in practice.

Today, however, these once-isolated instances, fundamentally alien to traditional American law, are becoming less rare, less the products of individual overreaching than of conscious implementation of policy by government officials, less liable to correction on appeal, less subject to exposure and criticism in the press and media, and less saddled with opprobrium in the minds of the public than ever before imaginable. Moreover, these once-isolated *instances* have been refined and amalgamated into a *coherent system of injustice*, consciously designed and cynically operated to employ the *forms* of American constitutional jurisprudence to attain ends destructive of the *substance* of that law *and falsely in the name of tha law*. A new strain of *lawlessness* is usurping the place, title, and prerogatives of American law.

The LaRouche case is a paradigmatic example of *why* this legal devolution is occurring, *how* it operates, and *what* its consequences must be.

The new, globalist 'legalities'

1) The forces of global oligarchism intend to reorganize the present international economic (dis)order along spurious "free-market" lines, in which a few world-embracing private cartels will control money and banking, capital-allocation and financial "markets," food production, energy, basic industries, and the media. Through various front-groups, the powers behind these cartels will constitute a *supra*national, politically unrepresentative and irresponsible, but economically all-powerful "directory" or "soviet" *to which every individual nation-state will be subordinated* in fact, if not strictly (and openly) by treaty or other legalistic statement of vassalage. As ostensibly "private" entities, the interlocking global cartels will depend upon and use the co-opted political "establishments" and suborned governments of the various nation-states to police their citizens *in accordance with the "new legalities"* of the *supra*national order.

These "new legalities" will have definite, if distasteful, characteristics. First, substantively, *nationalism* and *personal integrity* will be at least suspect, if not directly punishable. Nationalism threatens the undoing of the very worldwide "interdependence" on the basis of which the global cartels intend to impose utter economic dependence and (through

that) political subjugation on each country. For nationalists realistically recognize that *all* economies—even the widely misunderstood "free market"—are *political* economies, in which the adjective "political" dominates, and must always dominate, the noun "economy." The economy of the United States, for example, is called a "free market," because it rests on the principles of private property, personal liberty of contract, and so on. Yet these are undeniably *political* principles—without the enforcement of which by the government, the market would no longer be "free." And the peculiar "free market" of the United States rests also on the quintessentially political principles of taxation "for the common Defence and general Welfare," of "regula[tion] of Commerce," of a sound monetary system, and so on—notwithstanding (or perhaps because of) the implementation of which by the government the market remains "free." Thus, the United States enjoys, by constitutional mandate, what LaRouche correctly calls "the American system of political economy," a *uniquely national* system that arises out of and reflects the practical *political* genius—and, ultimately, *moral* insight—of America's Founding Fathers and the statesmen who carried forward their work. This system offers no place for *supra*national cartels manipulated by politically uncontrollable oligarchic forces hiding behind the mask of "free markets." So, in the new *supra*national economic order, the American system of political economy—and, with it, the nationalism on which it rests—must go, together with everyone who defends or advocates that nationalism.

Similarly, personal integrity, especially among political figures, is inconsistent with the globalists' penchant for subordinating timeless and generally applicable moral principles to the process of "cutting deals" on an *ad hoc* basis. Thus, the continued prominence, if not the existence, of those (such as LaRouche) who deny that political expedience is a morally viable policy, itself becomes inexpedient. And those (again, such as LaRouche) who dare to point out that the rhetoric the globalists employ to sugar-coat their corrupt "deals" intentionally conceals as much as it reveals by that exposure expose themselves to retaliation. In the new *supra*national economic order, no room will exist for accurate observers, let alone principled detractors, of "the emperor's new clothes."

Second, procedurally, the "new legalities" will embody techniques for managing, controlling, and suppressing questions and dissent that will range across the spectrum of viciousness, depending upon the oligarchs' perception of the danger the opposition poses. The more truthful, logical, persistent, *and popular* an opponent's criticisms of or proposed alternatives to their policies, the more threatening his presence—and the more immediate, violent, and openly arbitrary their acts of repression. So, in the new supranational economic order, the law will take on the character of a railroad ticket: legal "rules" will be "good for one day only"; and legal process will have a predetermined terminus for the victim—conviction.

Scrapping the Constitution

2) The LaRouche case exemplifies how the "new legalities" have already insinuated themselves into American criminal law—without, frighteningly, any significant outcry, admonishment, or even whimper of protest from the legal community, politicians, or the press and media. To the contrary: In so far as they espouse any position in public, the latter three groups appear affirmatively to *approve* of the treatment meted out to LaRouche, seemingly on the perverse theory—fatal to the survival of a constitutional republic—that LaRouche's supposed "political extremism" *both* rationalizes the employment of undoubtedly *extra*legal and arguably *anti*constitutional tactics to "put him away," *and* somehow guarantees everyone else continued legal immunity from the same fate. Perhaps these people are unfamiliar with the old adage that "to kill a dog, you must first call him mad" and its implication that *any* dog can be accused of madness. Perhaps they are simply "whistling in the dark," pretending not to see the already too-manifest danger which terrifies them into inaction—and, thereby, complicity. Perhaps they hope that, by that complicity of silence, they will secure themselves some tenuous immunity from a one-way ride on the "railroad."

Events are moving at too rapid a pace to give substance to such childish hopes, however. When the "new legalities" first surfaced here—in the form of liaison with the KGB in the Justice Department's Office of Special Investigations—the same rationalizations were current. People deluded themselves with the notion that the dangers of infiltrating KGB-style "justice" into American criminal law were minimal because the targets of the OSI were, after all, a few "Nazi war criminals" who deserved no better. Only a handful of Cassandras pointed out that, under American law, these *alleged* "Nazis" were only *accused,* not convicted of "war crimes"; and predicted that, were the theory of the OSI actually implemented, mere *accusations* would soon suffice for the imposition of such drastic penalties as deportation to certain death, thereby destroying a basic protection of traditional American jurisprudence in the interest of "putting across" one of the globalists' dirtier "deals." But so it came to pass.

The LaRouche conviction is an example of the natural—indeed, quite expectable—extrapolation of the "OSI principle" into domestic law. And the LaRouche conviction graphically illustrates the means of implementing that "principle" which Americans can expect their *secret* government to employ in the future, as it has in less-well-known past "railroading" operations.

- Initially, the secret government and its minions in the press and media create a climate of misunderstanding, fear, and hate against the intended victim, designed to spread the disinformation that he is a dangerous "political extremist" (usually of an "extreme right-wing" or "Nazi" persuasion). Predictably, few if any defenders of the victim come for-

ward—because of apathy ("Who cares about that fellow?"), fear ("One cannot afford to be associated with such an 'extremist'!"), prejudice ("People such as that deserve whatever they get."), or cynicism ("That's what happens for trying to fight the system!"). This preliminary "trial by press (perhaps, more accurately, *pre*-trial lynching) serves to induce a state of near-hysteria in the public, rendering next to impossible the selection of truly impartial judge and jurors in the inevitable prosecution.

The entire LaRouche process was a test: a test of the theory, a test of the operatives, a test of the mechanism, and especially a test of the reaction in the ultimate court, the court of American public opinion. As with all tyrannies, the supranational oligarchy advances with mincing, halting, and even timid steps in the beginning.

- The secret government then assigns to the case prosecutors distinguished for their amoral zealotry and lap-dog obedience to the "establishment."
- The prosecutors concoct charges against the victim only the perjorative and prejudicial nature of which outweighs their legal phoniness. Typically, these charges are structured especially to camouflage the true character of the prosecution as a political vendetta masquerading as enforcement of criminal law, and to denigrate the ideals and deny the dignity of the defendants by depicting them as "cheap crooks," "con men," "tax cheats," "conspirators," or other unprincipled social vermin.
- The secret government then carefully selects a special venue for the trial, one in which both judge and jury can be relied upon to rule as desired. In a sensitive case, the authorities may in addition arrange for a "ringer" or two to secure seats on the jury, to guarantee a favorable verdict.
- The judge then rushes the trial to judgment, oblivious to the needs of the defendants for time to investigate the charges, assemble evidence, prepare appropriate legal motions, and otherwise develop a cogent defense.
- The judge also excludes as "irrelevant" as many exculpatory defenses of the victims as possible, in effect forcing them to assume the burden of proof before a hostile jury that the acts they admittedly performed, and that the government alleges were "criminally" motivated, they performed innocently, in the "good faith" belief that what they did was lawful. In this way, the secret government arranges a "trial by political personality"—in that jurors infected with ineradicable prejudice from a *blitz* of media disinformation will almost always automatically attribute dishonesty to defendants whose political *personnae* they have been conditioned to hate or fear. Perhaps even unknowingly, the jurors actually convict the defendants, not of the "crimes" for which the secret government has indicted them (for which, in theory, it would be at least possible to find them *not* guilty), but instead for the undeniable and *unforgivable* offense of opposing the "establishment" (for which, of course, a verdict of "not guilty" is impossible).
- And, finally, appeals to higher courts receive only *pro forma* "review" and affirmance of the convictions, or denial of a hearing altogether. Typically, rather than carefully examining the defendants' specifications of legal error in the trial, the appeals courts allude to supposedly "overwhelming evidence of guilt" that renders any alleged errors "harmless"—disarming critics of what transpired by filling the law reports with another layer of disinformation to which government apologists may point to "prove" that the defendants enjoyed a "fair trial."

A test case

3) The secret government's blatant employment of what may be styled the "crime of offensive political personality" ("offensive," that is, to the "establishment") in the LaRouche case is not the end of sordid developments in this area—any more than creation of the OSI amounted to a unique aberration. The entire LaRouche process was a test: a test of the theory, a test of the operatives, a test of the mechanism, and especially *a test of the reaction* in the ultimate court, the court of American public opinion. As with all tyrannies, the *supra*national oligarchy advances with mincing, halting, uncertain, and even timid steps *in the beginning*. Every lawyer who follows such matters knows of *many* instances in which the secret government has "framed," "railroaded," or harassed through "trumped-up" charges some "little" man, for political reasons. Indeed, the very invisibility of such victims emboldens the "establishment" to strike at them. The LaRouche case represents a new wave of political repression through "legal" means, a wave that strikes at *highly visible* victims whom, through preliminary "trial by press," the secret government has rendered odious and therefore undefendable in the eyes of the gullible public. With the success of this prosecution, the stage will be set for the next assault: at political enemies of the "establishment" who *cannot* be effectively defamed, but whose convictions the public will accept anyway, as a generation of Russians and other captive peoples did during the Stalin era.

Who says "It cannot happen here!"? It *is* happening, and can only become worse. The important question is, "What are Americans going to do about it?"—*now, before it is too late*.