

The FBI's 20-year campaign to silence LaRouche and associates

In the ongoing trial in Boston, Massachusetts, of U.S.A. v. The LaRouche Campaign, et al., Prosecutor John Markham is seeking to convict Lyndon LaRouche and other defendants of "conspiracy to obstruct justice." The trial is expected to last six months to a year, at least. The defendants are all members of the National Caucus of Labor Committees, the philosophical association which LaRouche initiated 20 years ago. We publish here slightly abridged excerpts from the Dec. 18 opening statement of Mayer Morganroth, attorney for defendant Edward W. Spannaus. For a report on the opening statement of LaRouche's lawyer, Odin Anderson, see EIR, Jan. 8, 1988.

... The real "crime," the evidence will show, is that Mr. Spannaus can write. Mr. Spannaus and other defendants have ideas, they have concepts, and they have a voice. That's the "crime" that's gone back, according to the evidence, for 20 years, that the FBI has tried to stop, going back to the time that the FBI was under Mr. Hoover, that no new ideas—only a two-party political system was allowed and no new functions or thoughts should be tolerated.

You'll hear the concept of a sting operation, and the evidence will show why the defendants believed in a sting operation in the situation; what the government did, is put in informants throughout this small organization at that time. Evidence will show that they didn't just put in one informant or two informants or a few, that they put as many informants as there were members, if not more, unbeknownst to the defendants.

The evidence will show, by the FBI's own records over that 20-year period, that in many instances there were more informants working for the FBI and agents of the FBI at meetings than there were members. The evidence will further show that these informants were put in for several purposes. One was to report back to the FBI and tell them everything that was going on for 20 years.

Another purpose was in order to cause the defendants to do some provocative acts suggested by that informant, so that they could be held guilty of a crime that they never intended to commit. Another purpose was for the informants to cause such disruption that the defendants' voice would be stilled and their rights in the world would be chilled and ended forever.

The evidence will show that these informants were not just at one location, but they were all over the country. In every place there was a chapter, there were numerous informants. The evidence will show that at one particular time, there were 14 informants, just in the New York chapter, working for the FBI, unbeknownst, of course, to the defendants, who were trying to get their voice heard, but had that voice very often distorted and compromised by an informant, who would say something to provoke or cause a problem to the defendants.

The chapters that informants were in, and numerous in each one, were St. Louis, Cleveland, Detroit, New York, Chicago, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, Philadelphia, Washington, Buenos Aires, Caracas, Baltimore, New Haven, Portland, Richmond, Seattle, Springfield, Albany, Buffalo, Charlotte, Cincinnati, Denver, Indianapolis, Milwaukee; San Juan, Puerto Rico; Atlanta, Newark, and, very interestingly, Boston. Boston has had informants and Boston has been involved in this kind of behavior for some 15 years, minimally.

Agents who were just in charge of the particular locations that were conducting this situation putting informants in: Mr. Deily—these were the agents that the FBI, at their own offices, were conducting and controlling the informants and had several agents working under them at these locations: Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Wannal. . . .

Mr. Markham: Your Honor, objection. Relevance.

The Court: Overruled.

Mr. Morganroth: Mr. Hageessa, Mr. Shackelford, Mr. Mignosa, Mr. Brunich. By the way, Mr. Brunich was in charge of the Boston office, went to the Washington, D.C. office, and came back to Boston, and was replaced, in part of the time before he was replaced, by a Mr. [Richard] Egan, who was one of the FBI agents involved in this particular matter.

Mr. Tansy, the director of the FBI, Mr. Kelly, Mr. Webster, Mr. Hoover were all involved. Mr. Robinson, Mr. Seavitt, Mr. Redfield, Mr. Kolombatori, Mr. Brune, Mr. McCasline, Mr. Mintz, Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Lex, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Yelvington, Mr. Jones, Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Minogue, Mr. Jones, Mr. Mulholland, Mr. Kinney, Mr. Laprode, Mr. Padreira.

Those were the basic agents in charge of those particular

locations. However, they had many agents working under them. In Cleveland alone, there were five agents working under the particular FBI in charge, agents in Cleveland, Ohio.

Mind you, at many times there were more agents and more informants than there were members. And, of course, in a way, the membership swelled to a certain extent, because a great many of the members were really FBI informants and agents. Some meetings had more agents in them than they did members. They could have voted anything they wanted.

FBI dirty tricks

The evidence will show that the agents had the informants do certain acts and the agents themselves did certain acts over this entire period, never ceasing, acts such as calling the banks that the defendants had their accounts at, to find out the balances, to find out what the financial situations were, tapping their phone lines. And there will be evidence to show that the FBI, in their own memorandum, states, Gee, we're breaking the law, we shouldn't be doing this, but let's do it.

They'd monitor the phone calls. They would threaten particular members. And the way they would threaten them, is they'd go to their employers, get them fired by telling their employers, "These kind of people shouldn't work for you"; going to their parents and telling them, "Hey, you know, your kids are in some movement that's terrible," and getting them disassociated with their parents, conducting burglaries, stealing their mail, their bank account records, their driver's licenses, so they could then send it through the entire network and through Washington, in order to find out who that person is; taking pictures of everyone that came in and out of the buildings, and then have them checked out and send their pictures around the country to the FBI agents and the offices.

If you recall, there was something in the opening statement yesterday about taking a picture of Mr. Egan. That may have been a "confrontation," but that's not the first time they took the picture of an FBI agent, when they knew it was one. They did it many times before, and not just for "confrontation." It was so that they could have a picture. They knew that person was an FBI agent, and they would circulate it, so that chapters would know, if this person became a member, that he was really an FBI agent.

The fact of the matter is, there were raids that were perpetrated at shotgun point, holding people against the wall while they took membership lists and anything they could that was not called for in any subpoena.

The evidence will further show that they would have the informants inside the chapters, and what they would do is have them feed back information to the FBI as to any weaknesses of any particular member, if they had a psychological problem, if they had a problem with a parent or they had an argument with their wife; and then the FBI would have the informant or somebody in the organization play upon that, to cause dissension and disruption.

They would have the informant inform the FBI, through

all these years, where they would go at every instant, in every chapter. And what would be waiting for them? The police would give them a ticket for selling newspapers or for driving without a headlight, or no tickets, just stop them. What they would do is take down their license plate numbers, their licenses, and who they were. And it would go out through the entire FBI network around the country, and the FBI would then have them on file as members of the NCLC. The FBI did very well with that.

They also put them, according to the evidence, on ADEX if they were a member of the NCLC. That's enemies of the United States government, to be arrested in case of conflict. They continued trying to break down the particular defendants' organization. They would steal their documents. And the evidence will show they arrested people for selling newspapers. Can you imagine arresting a kid walking down the street selling newspapers? That's what they did. If they would sell their newspaper, they were arrested for it.

But they did even something far more heinous. You heard in the opening statements yesterday about going to plants. The FBI would notify particular companies, because the informants would tell them in advance that the defendants were going to sell newspapers near their property or outside, or that the defendants were going to give circulars out, in order to solicit people to become members. The AFL-CIO representatives, union people, would then come out and beat them up, time after time, with FBI agents standing and watching. Sure, some of the FBI agents' pictures were taken. And, of course, they resented that. Police standing and watching, too.

They continued doing this for 20 years, and during the course of that time, they attempted to destroy the organization through informants. They also attempted through that behavior to get people to leave the organization and then become either informants, by turning them, or to be able to put them on the stand to testify to things that would be damaging to the organization, after the FBI and the informants had worked on them all those years to get them disenchanted, and get them out.

Financial warfare

The FBI and also the FEC [Federal Election Commission], through all the years, the evidence will show, tried every which way to stop the financial ability and capability of the defendants, so they would have no money to work with. It's interesting, in Mr. Markham's opening statement, how he talks about how they couldn't pay loans back. It's also interesting to note that all the FBI did, and the FEC, was, at every turn for years, to stop them from getting donations, stop them from getting money, make them spend tremendous amounts of money to try and defend themselves legally and to sue the FBI.

The evidence will show there are suits against the FBI to restrain them from this kind of conduct, that have been pending for 13 years in jurisdictions in this country, and suits

against the FEC that were filed. The defendants did afford themselves of the legal process. And if anybody “stalled and appealed” for 13 years, the evidence will show who it was.

The fact of the matter is, that the FBI talks about the fact that the defendants couldn’t pay some loans back, yet *they* created the problem. It reminds me of the child who shoots the mother and father, then pleads for mercy on the grounds he’s an orphan. They create the problem, and then say the defendants violate.

What they did was constantly stop any money that they could from getting to the defendants, because that would kill them, that would destroy them. They would get their bank account balances to make sure there was money in them. They would see how much the rent was, and they would even contact the phone company to know what the phone bill was, to see if they can pay it, in an effort to make sure that they would not survive.

The evidence will show that the first thing Mr. Egan did, when he knew a subpoena was going to be issued, was he called up a bank and told them the FBI is going to do something to these people and so is the Justice Department. The bank just closed down the funds again. Interestingly enough, according to the evidence, it will be shown, it was done just before Mr. LaRouche was supposed to go on television, in a campaign, and stopped the money for him to go on television.

Interestingly enough, it will be shown it was done just before the election. Interestingly enough, the “crime” that will be shown to have been committed by the defendants was having an idea, or having thoughts, that the FBI, through its stubbornness, couldn’t stop 20 years ago. They’re still trying to stop it and they can’t stop it, so they are going to ask *you* to do their dirty work for them.

The evidence will further show that there was an FBI informant by the name of Michael Vernon Higgins. Michael Vernon Higgins joined the NCLC as a supposed member, who would espouse and want to pursue the thoughts and ideas. And Michael Vernon Higgins ran for office for the state legislature in Michigan, on the ticket with the NCLC. Michael Higgins, after being there for some time, finally came and confessed that he was an FBI agent, an informant, and that his conscience had got the worst of him.

He also confessed he had been one summarily—so like Mr. [Roy] Frankhauser—for the Ku Klux Klan, the American Nazi Party, had been involved in the Pontiac school bus bombing, all for the FBI, and he became a member of the NCLC for the FBI and ran for office under their banner as an FBI agent, despite the fact of his oath that he took when he ran for office, that he was not running except under the beliefs he had. The evidence will show that he confessed to these particular situations, and it’s a parallel to Mr. Frankhauser.

What you haven’t heard, and you’re going to hear now, the evidence will show, is that Mr. Frankhauser worked for the government before he ever became a member of the NCLC—which he never did. Let me correct myself on that. Before he was a paid consultant, as a security person, by the

NCLC, he himself worked for the Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms division of the United States government as an agent. He worked for the National Security Council as an agent, the NSC. He worked actually for the United States government. He came to the defendants as a paid consultant, on the basis that he worked for the United States government and that he was in these hate groups for them, because that’s when he was in the hate groups, when he worked for the United States government—the same as was Michael Vernon Higgins. In the [prosecution’s] opening statement, saying that the defendants hired Roy Frankhauser knowing he was a member of the hate groups, chopped off to the point, after it had been shown to them that he was an employee of the United States government in those hate groups, and was actually giving information to the defendants about the hate groups, and to the United States government.

Now, Mr. Markham told you that evidence will come from the stand. He said, “You will hear, You will hear.” And what you’re going to hear from, is either informants, or you’re going to hear from people, who after 20 years, 10 years, 15 years of pressure, not by the defendants to raise money, but by the FBI to close them down from being able to raise money, from harassment, intimidation, threats, to do exactly what they’re doing—to leave the organization and help them in testifying against the defendants, through that kind of threats, intimidation, pressure, and frustration.

And as you heard from Mr. Markham, a Mr. [Forrest Lee] Fick turned an informant for them. He is going to take the stand. Same example. Mr. Fick, who is not really a member, but worked for Mr. Frankhauser, will take the stand. But remember, Mr. Fick is the one they had call one of the defendants, to ask him to send *him* out of the country. And the fact that the defendant said, “We wouldn’t do a thing like that,” Mr. Markham, in his opening statement, made it a crime. Hard to believe, but the evidence will show that was in conformity with the proper exercise of discretion and no crime was committed, except to have ideas and concepts that were totally against Mr. Hoover at the time and to have a third voice in the world.

The evidence will further show that the defendants felt and believed this was a sting operation and that the defendants afforded themselves of the courts and have always afforded themselves of the courts in trying to get, so to speak, the monkey off their back.

They have gone to courts all over the country. They have defended themselves and filed suits. But this is the criminal proceeding. Twenty years, it took them [the FBI] to get here to this criminal proceeding. And you will hear evidence, where they tried to get them [the defendants] into crimes every which way. . . .

And in every instance, what they were trying to do was get a crime created, through all these 20 years. And the evidence will show that the only crime that was committed by my client is writing in a notebook. And I think you will find that from the evidence.