

the U.S. Labor Party—LaRouche's short-lived attempt to create a third party in the American Whig tradition—that the Jimmy Carter-controlled National Security Council had launched a 60-day program to bankrupt the LaRouche organization, using FEC investigations as one of its chief instruments.

● In February of 1980 Citizens for LaRouche, CFL, filed a watertight submission for matching funds, which was approved by the FEC. Lyndon LaRouche was contesting the Democratic presidential nomination, and the press organs of the Eastern Establishment went wild. *The New York Times*, *Washington Post*, *Philadelphia Inquirer*, etc. all howled in rage that a "fringe candidate" had made it through a "loop-hole" in the law. The FEC launched ten simultaneous "investigations" that were still going strong two years later, with no end in sight. CFL's books were put under a microscope and contributors again raked over the coals—only this time they had to be subpoenaed first.

One Baltimore CFL volunteer described in a court deposition why she had "seriously considered dropping out of the LaRouche campaign as a result of this investigation": "This was not because of anything the campaign did or did not do. I just did not want the hassle when I was starting a new job of having marshals at my house . . . and having to explain to my employer that I was being questioned by the federal government as a result of my political activities." Since the FEC was legally required to expedite such investigations, they were all prolonged by the ruse of calling them "preliminary" investigations.

FEC 'Star Chamber'

Patricia Dolbeare, as Treasurer of CFL, sued the FEC. On March 9, 1982 Federal District Court Judge Charles Brieant issued a preliminary injunction against the FEC, in a landmark decision in an area—chastising a federal investigation—which the judge himself called "an uncharted sea."

"It would be hard to imagine a more abusive visitation of bureaucratic power," said Judge Brieant of the FEC's methods in his *Dolbeare vs. FEC* ruling. "We doubt that the congressional sponsors in enacting this supposedly remedial legislation ever expected or intended that a volunteer political group would become so enmeshed in governmental red tape and bureaucratic nitpicking as to be visited with as many MURs [FEC investigations] as have been visited upon these plaintiffs, without prompt conclusion. . . . These MURs are not, nor should they become, a Star Chamber Proceeding. It is not a crime for someone such as LaRouche, clearly not a part of the mainstream of the Democratic Party . . . to seek its nomination."

As a result of Brieant's injunction, the FEC's investigation and the CFL suit were settled through voluntary "conciliation" proceedings. When this settlement became unglued, CFL and FEC went back to court again, where they still are: it is this defense of LaRouche's rights under law and the Constitution to which FEC General Counsel Charles Steele objects. The payments in dispute from the FEC's 1980-82 vendetta against LaRouche are what Steele cites as his basis for claiming that LaRouche doesn't qualify for matching funds this time around.

Why the FEC denied LaRouche matching funds

FEC General Counsel Charles Steele's "Statement of Reasons" accompanying the FEC's rejection of the LaRouche matching fund submission, contains falsehoods patently designed to inflame the Commissioners against LaRouche.

We present a few of counsel Steele's "reasons" below:

On Jan. 13, 1984, the Office of the General Counsel submitted a recommendation to the Commission that Mr. LaRouche be denied eligibility to receive matching funds. On January 14, 1984, after this recommendation was made public, Mr. LaRouche's counsel contacted the Office of the General Counsel to discuss what Mr. LaRouche could do to satisfy the stated concerns. In addition, prior to the Commission's meeting of January 19, 1984, Commis-

sioners and staff persons reported receiving harrasing, threatening and obscene phone calls, at home and in the office, from persons identifying themselves as LaRouche supporters. They are continuing to receive such calls. During the morning of the Commission meeting, persons identifying themselves as LaRouche supporters picketed outside the agency, accusing the Commission, named Commissioners, and staff of a variety of activities, including being biased, Nazis, and controlled by the KGB, as well as homosexuality.

The Commission has determined that the arguments raised by Lyndon LaRouche . . . as well as his failure to make the repayment which has been due and owing to the U.S. Treasury for more than a year . . . demonstrate that he has repudiated his undertakings in his 1979 letter. . . . The Commission finds that the repudiation of his obligations under the 1979 candidate agreement provides strong evidence that the promises made by Mr. LaRouche in his Dec. 30, 1983 letter are not made with a good faith intention to fulfill those promises.