

Defense case begins in Alexandria witchhunt

by Marianna Wertz

On Dec. 9, day eleven of the trial of Lyndon LaRouche and six associates, the defense began the presentation of its case in the federal courthouse in Alexandria, Virginia. From the very beginning of the defense case, the Big Lie that the prosecution has been trying to present to the jury, and to the slander-hungry press that often crowds the courtroom, was torn to shreds.

In the course of nearly seven hours of testimony, 13 defense witnesses finally put to rest, for any honest man to judge, the government's concoction that the National Caucus of Labor Committees (NCLC) is a conspiracy, run top-down by and for the sole purpose of promoting Lyndon LaRouche. With two more full days of defense testimony, it is expected that if this is an honest jury, it will acquit the defendants on all counts by the end of the week.

The testimony accomplished two important objectives, in addition to tearing apart the prosecution's theory of the case: It positively established the reality of the LaRouche movement's political influence in the world; and it destroyed the credibility of the prosecution's two key witnesses in the conspiracy case.

The first witness for the defense was Herbert Quinde, member of the NCLC, *EIR's* national security correspondent, and expert on security-intelligence matters for the philosophical association. Outlining the actual extent of LaRouche's influence, Quinde testified to the subscriber circulation of publications associated with LaRouche to over 300 cabinet and sub-cabinet level officers in the early years of the Reagan administration, including, by name, former Energy Secretary James Watt, National Security Council member Norman Bailey, and Presidential Science Adviser Ray Pollock. He identified subscribers in the CIA, NSC, DEA—"the

whole alphabet of government agencies"—to such publications as *Executive Intelligence Review* and *Fusion* magazine. "We had two feet in the government," Quinde said.

Then, according to Quinde, opponents of LaRouche's pro-SDI, anti-drug views began to set up "a chill" through the media in late 1983/early 1984. A "vicious and violent attack" in the *New Republic* magazine in November 1984, and the same year's so-called exposé on NBC's First Camera show, forced a break from LaRouche by the administration, and launched what has become one of the greatest witchhunts in modern political history.

The purpose of this testimony was to refute the government's claim, that fundraisers for the LaRouche movement took loans in the years 1983 to 1987, though they knew that the money did not exist to repay those loans in a "timely" fashion. Quinde demonstrated instead, that the movement's expectations were founded on real accomplishments, and, despite "financial warfare" and "a cyclical barrage of newspaper attacks," the organization remained "culturally optimistic. Obstacles were seen as part of our political activity," he said.

A real war on drugs

A second major charge of the government is that fundraisers raised loans based on false claims that the money would be used to finance the publication of the book *Dope, Inc.* The defense contends that the funds were raised not just to publish the book, but to conduct a real war on drugs, where the American government has just been "saying no."

Quinde gave the jury a gripping account of how a real "war on drugs" was run by the LaRouche movement in 1985. "Operation Guatusa" was launched when the government of

Guatemala was convinced, by LaRouche's associates, to run the first military action in Ibero-America against narcotics traffickers. LaRouche investigators had identified for the Guatemalan government a drug running operation in Guatemala that was financing Marxist guerrilla activities. The government gave *EIR* an exclusive view of the drug raid, from a command post in the jungle. Participating in the observation team were defendant Dennis Small, together with official representatives of the CIA, Pentagon, and the Delta Force.

Prosecution zealot hands LaRouche victory

The highpoint of Quinde's 90-minute testimony came during his cross-examination by prosecution attorney John Markham, the Boston attorney who also led the prosecution of LaRouche in last year's Boston trial. Through his overzealousness to discredit Quinde's powerful testimony, Markham thought he could trick Quinde into lying on the stand. He asked, "Is it important to tell the truth? Haven't you made calls when you haven't told the truth?" Defense attorneys loudly objected. Presiding federal district Judge Albert Bryan sustained the objection, instructing Markham to give a "specific example" to the witness. Markham was caught.

"You called Edward Bennett Williams, using a false name, didn't you?" Markham asked, referring to the recently deceased Democratic Party power-broker. Quinde assented. "That's lying, not to give your right name, isn't it?" Markham asked, nearly salivating in his enthusiasm. Quinde replied, "yes."

For so little gain, the prosecution opened the door to LaRouche's attorney Odin Anderson, who asked Quinde to give the jury the full account of his phone conversation with Williams. According to Quinde, Williams told him in the 1986 conversation, that he "wanted to nail LaRouche to the boards." Williams's client, *Washington Post* publisher Katharine Graham, was furious at LaRouche for recent articles exposing her role in her husband's death in LaRouche-associated publications. In addition, Williams's former client, Henry Kissinger, was part of a faction in the National Security Council who wanted to "get something started" against LaRouche in the Justice Department.

"We could never have gotten that in, without Markham," commented one defense attorney after Quinde's testimony ended. Now the jury knew who had in fact been the masterminds behind this trial.

Soviet operations against LaRouche

But the onion was peeled for the jury still further by subsequent witnesses, who detailed from their own top-level expertise, the role of the Soviet government in top-down command over the "get LaRouche" operations.

Gen. Louis Giuffrida, counter-terrorism expert and former Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) under the Reagan administration, gave expert testimony on the reasonableness and prudence of the security

surrounding the residence maintained by the LaRouches as a safehouse in Loudoun County, Virginia. After stating that, according to his independent investigation, the threat against LaRouche from pro-Soviet terrorist organizations was real, Giuffrida testified that the security for the residence was "reasonable and prudent."

His testimony exploded the government's contention that the LaRouche movement spent money extravagantly in securing LaRouche's life, at the expense of loan repayments. Asked by defense attorney Kenly Webster, "Would you call this a 'Cadillac defense'?" Giuffrida responded, "In the car context, I'd call it a VW bug."

In the afternoon, Brig. Gen. Paul-Albert Scherer reinforced the Giuffrida testimony, with his own expert opinion. Former head of military intelligence for the West German armed forces, Scherer testified that his independent investigation of LaRouche, conducted over the past five years, led him to conclude that LaRouche was the subject of Soviet operations, aimed at discrediting him, for the ultimate purpose of destroying him physically. General Scherer further stated that he had volunteered to come to the U.S. to testify on LaRouche's behalf, because "In my opinion, anyone who tries to work against the Soviet threat should have protection." Asked about LaRouche himself, Scherer said, "The man is ready to sacrifice himself for his ideals and goals."

International impact

Other witnesses testified to LaRouche's international impact, and the importance of the work his movement has conducted around the world. Following Herbert Quinde, NCLC member Sylvia Brewda, a computer analyst, testified to dozens of projects she had worked on, to design plans for economic development for such countries as Peru, Argentina, Japan, West Germany, and Mexico.

Mrs. Brewda detailed at length a project contracted by the Peruvian equivalent of the National Association of Manufacturers with *EIR*, to design a computer model that would chart the best path for the growth and development of the Peruvian economy. This kind of work also demonstrated to the jury the economic viability of the LaRouche movement itself, which was being paid for its economic consulting by governments around the world.

Juan Rebaza, president of the largest fishing company in the world, Pesca-Peru, testified following Mrs. Brewda, on the work that defendant Dennis Small, leader in the LaRouche movement's Ibero-American organization, had done throughout Ibero-America. He spoke of their meeting with Rebaza's friend, Peruvian President Alan García, and of numerous meetings with trade union leaders throughout the continent, to promote the economic integration of Ibero-America.

Later in the day, Dr. John Seale, the British AIDS expert, testified on the impact of the LaRouche movement's work on AIDS internationally, and on the harassment which he had

suffered as a result of working with LaRouche in the United States.

Prosecution's case discredited

The discrediting of the prosecution's case actually began with their own final "defector" witness, Wayne Hintz. Hintz resigned from the NCLC in 1986, according to his own testimony, because he had concluded that the "loan situation" was "too difficult" for him to manage. However, unlike the other former members, Steve Bardwell, Christian Curtis, and Charles Tate, who had testified with clear prejudice earlier, Hintz refused to give the prosecution the venomous lies that the others had so willingly concocted.

At every point, Hintz remained honest in saying that the defendants' organizations were attempting to repay the loans, although with inadequate funds. In fact, Hintz's testimony was so favorable to the defense that prosecutor Kent Robinson early on began virtually to cross-examine his own witness. This fact was noted in open court, and acknowledged

by Judge Bryan.

The lies of other prosecution witnesses were exposed in turn, as the defense put on three NCLC members and three FBI agents to conclude the first day of their case. The FBI agents were brought to the stand to testify to the accuracy of Tate's and Curtis's testimony, relative to statements they had earlier given those agents. The impeachment was clear, as both Tate and Curtis had substantially changed key parts of their testimony between the time they were interviewed by the FBI and the time they appeared as government witnesses on the stand in Alexandria.

Richard Spida, the only other person identified by Tate as being present when defendant Will Wertz is alleged by Tate to have said "there is no such thing as a loan," denied ever having heard Wertz make the statement, and denied ever having spoken with Tate about the subject. Since Spida himself was not a fundraiser at the time of the alleged remark, Tate's mendaciousness became abundantly clear.

Another NCLC member, Sanford Roberts, testified that

International figures speak up for LaRouche

While only a few international figures were able to become witnesses in the LaRouche trial, numerous others have sent personal messages of support to be available to the court. We excerpt them here:

My friend Lyndon LaRouche

. . . As head of the "Alliance" Resistance network, a network of 3,000 persons (more than 30% of them died in serving our fatherland)—ambassadors, generals of the French Army, civil servants of the higher ranks and concerned citizens from all walks of life—I learnt during the whole period of World War II, between 1940 and 1945, to make judgements on people. The correctness of my judgments was a matter of life and death for the individual fate of all the men and women patriots under my orders, as well as for the collective fate of my country.

It is therefore from the standpoint of this knowledgeable judgement, formed under such tragic circumstances, that I can assert with a firm conviction that Mr. Lyndon LaRouche is a perfectly generous and honest person on all accounts. He is the kind of man who acts according to his word; and if he displeases some, it is because of his constant lack of diplomacy in defense of what he believes to be the truth.

I will add that I am even shocked and, to say the truth, angry, to have to stand for a man whom I deeply regard

and whose reputation should hold by itself, were those who judge him themselves inspired by truth and fairness.

Marie-Madeleine Fourcade

Commander of the Legion of Honor, France

As a Spaniard, and a practicing lawyer who is personally involved in fighting narcotics traffic, I have carefully followed over a period of years the debate around the case of Lyndon LaRouche.

I am convinced:

—that Mr. LaRouche is the object of merciless prosecution, caused by the worst political intriguing I have ever seen

—that behind the supposedly legal forces used against Mr. LaRouche, are hidden political and economic power which Mr. LaRouche threatens. . .

Víctor Girauta y Armada

Lawyer, Spain

I declare that I have known Mr. Lyndon LaRouche for several years, have read the majority of his works, and have followed his social-political direction with great interest.

He appears to be a correct and honorable person, very clear in his concepts and determined in his ideas, with a vision of the world and of politics very much in line with Christian humanism, and which offers real perspectives in the future for a better and more just world.

Father Pedro Rubio

Augustinian Order of the Philippines

Madrid, Nov. 22

Tate's alleged meeting with him about Wertz's alleged statement was actually about a statement that Wertz had made, stating that the LaRouche presidential campaign committee would be seeking loan forgiveness from those to whom it still owed money in 1984.

Marjorie Hecht, NCLC member and former manager of *Fusion* magazine, showed through her testimony that former member Steven Bardwell was lying when he stated that *Fusion* had not fulfilled the full sum of issues for which subscribers had paid.

Finally, NCLC member Dana Scanlon, who had refused the government's offer of immunity to testify as a prosecution witness, testified to having personally paid for the furniture in the safehouse used by the LaRouches in Virginia, and that the furnishings were done "in the cheapest possible way."

The defense expects to complete its case by Dec. 14. If so, and barring extensive rebuttal witnesses by the government, the case will go to the jury for final determination a week before Christmas.

I am a long-time defense analyst and commentator, with an international reputation as a writer, broadcaster and lecturer. In the course of my many activities I have had to familiarize myself with a broad spectrum of opinion. . . .

Lyndon LaRouche's material formed part of that spectrum of opinion. . . . It is well known I have marked reservations concerning his "conspiracy" theses, preferring a more casual relationship between events. Nevertheless, I have always respected and admired his wide-ranging interests and his ability to construct plausible analyses on subjects he has addressed in his public statements.

S.R. Elliot
Surrey, England

1) I am a medical practitioner and elected Councillor in the City of Exeter and have been engaged for some years in campaigning on pro-family issues and in other social and moral issues. I act as adviser to a pressure group known as Conservative Family Campaign. Through publicity given to my work relating to AIDS, I was contacted by the LaRouche organisation in Germany and known to me as *Executive Intelligence Review*.

2) On several occasions my advice has been sought and my opinion canvassed both via telephone and letter and concerning measures political and social needed to help curb the spread of AIDS. . . .

8) In all my communications with *Executive Intelligence Review* I have been of the impression they are a legitimate organisation . . . and seeking to promote his [LaRouche's] views in a sensible and democratic manner.

Dr. Adrian A. Rogers, Exeter, England

Brainin, Ludwig dedicate concert to Lyndon LaRouche

by John Sigerson

To be exposed to the works of a truly great man or woman, or still better, to meet with them in person, can never fail to uplift any but the most withered soul. But to hear one great man, in his own language of preference, paying tribute to another of equal stature, not only elevates us, but makes us, so to speak, junior senators among the great assembly of those composers, statesmen, and scientists who confer with each other across continents, generations, and even millennia.

It was this higher dialogue which characterized the violinist Norbert Brainin's beautiful musical tribute in Washington, D.C. on Dec. 2, "Dedicated to Mr. Brainin's Good Friend Lyndon H. LaRouche." Mr. Brainin, the first violinist of the world-renowned Amadeus Quartet, and the West German pianist Günter Ludwig performed three classical sonatas in a way which could not have failed to please Mr. LaRouche, who, along with a number of associates, has been warring in an Alexandria, Virginia court against those agencies of evil who believe that Western civilization is a horrible mistake, never to be repeated.

The concert was sponsored by the Commission to Investigate Human Rights Violations, for the benefit of the Constitutional Defense Fund, which is funding the legal defense of LaRouche and his associates. In a short introductory remark to the concert, Mr. Brainin said he was "here tonight to pay homage to a great man," and "to bear witness to his stainless character." Mr. Brainin added that he was also playing the concert "because I love the United States. God bless America!"

But the fact that the concert was a tribute to LaRouche, was only one element of the productive tension around the event. With the help of a recent National Public Radio program about the Schiller Institute's initiative to lower the standard tuning-pitch to A=432, rumors had been flying around Washington musical circles that Mr. Brainin would lead the charge by playing at the lowered tuning.

Alas, that was not to be, mostly because the very short