

were likely part of Operation Chaos, later exposed in a congressional hearing that led to a major shake-up of the U.S. intelligence community. Operation Chaos was the CIA codename for an unauthorized program of domestic surveillance targeting anti-war activists. After the exposé, the surveillance program, run out of the CIA Office of Security, was quietly turned over to the FBI.

A mobster for the FBI

Fino hooked up with the FBI in 1972. By 1973, with FBI backing, he took over as business manager for Laborers Union Local 210, running on a reform platform. Over the years, Fino rose in stature, becoming a "pillar of the community." His union's pension fund invested \$80 million in constructing hotels and office buildings in the downtown area of the industrially depressed city. The *News* reported, "The flamboyant Fino, a commercial pilot and low-handicap golfer who seemed more at home with corporate executives than the laborers he represented, enjoyed the company of bankers, leaders of the black community, and politicians during his 15 years as business manager of Local 210."

Although the son of a well-known Mafia lieutenant, Fino denied his union had any links to organized crime. But he was telling the FBI another story. He leaked the same information he was giving the FBI to selected reporters, which produced stories about impending indictments of mob figures, months before they occurred.

Fino maintained close connections with mobsters and Laborers Union officials in Cleveland and Chicago. His lawyer for 17 years, Paul Cambria, also represented Harold Friedman, the recently convicted Teamster vice president. Recently deceased Teamster president Jackie Presser was an FBI informant. Henry Rossbacher, an Assistant U.S. Attorney in Los Angeles until two years ago, is representing Fino in his negotiations with the FBI.

ACLU to LaRouche's defense?

The Fino case highlights a pattern which is increasingly disturbing to civil libertarians. The FBI is again out of control, but since the outrages are directed at LaRouche, the defenders of the First Amendment have been slow in shaking off their liberal ideological blinders to realize that if the government can silence LaRouche, they may well be next.

But a recent article in an anti-CIA publication is indicative that even some of LaRouche's harshest critics from the left are waking up.

The winter 1989 issue of *Covert Action Information Bulletin* (CAIB) reports on illegal FBI operations against the "LaRouche organization." In an article entitled "COINTEL-PRO in the '80s: The 'New' FBI," *Boston Globe* investigative reporter Ross Gelbspan highlights the LaRouche case in a section subtitled, "Spying on LaRouche." The article is a review of several illegal FBI operations, including those against the Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador (CISPES).

Interview: Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

'The court could have

Mr. LaRouche granted the following interview on Feb. 4 to Lonnie Wolfe of EIR News for Loudoun County, a local paper in Leesburg affiliated with EIR, from the Alexandria Detention Center in Alexandria, Virginia. We reprint it here in a slightly condensed version.

EIR: You and your associates have stated that the Alexandria trial was "rigged" to achieve a guilty verdict. Given the government's animus, and the campaign of vilification, do you think it possible that you could have gotten a fair trial anywhere in the U.S.?

LaRouche: Broadly, the answer is yes. You have to distinguish between two things. First of all, the rigging, the arrogant absolute rigging of the Alexandria trial, which was a fraud from beginning to end, by the government and by the court, as opposed from the difficulties of assuring a fair jury trial, say in the Eastern District of Alexandria. For example, the case of Boston, where three weeks approximately were spent in obtaining a jury selection, through proper voir dire processes, which of course was not allowed in Alexandria.

After the conclusion of some months, it ended in a mistrial caused by the government's dilatory tactics. The jury polled itself after discharge, and said it would have acquitted all the defendants on all charges, and said the case was dominated by government misconduct. So that demonstrates that a fair trial is possible, under proper conditions. In Alexandria, it was not.

There is of course a difficulty in the Eastern District of Virginia, where you have a very special kind of liberal ideological influence in the population, which makes it rather difficult to get an impartial jury for anyone who is not that type of liberal. But it would be possible if the court were to attempt to do it.

EIR: You have written that "all your enemies are evil." Could you explain that?

LaRouche: I distinguish between those who may disagree with me, who may be right or wrong, and those who are evil. An example of what I mean by evil is illustrated by the case of Uganda. Uganda, of course, according to my information, has 60% of its population infected with the HIV virus, otherwise known as the AIDS virus, which means the nation is extinct. The starvation and mass death in black Africa has been the result of a deliberate policy by the most powerful

held a fair trial'

international financial institutions in the world, who happen to be my enemies. They are quite evil.

And the Soviets, of course, are a related case there also. Moscow is quite evil. It's the same kind of problem. As I say, distinguish between those who are my enemies, who are behind the Alexandria process, for example, and those people who simply, for one reason or another, happen to disagree with me.

EIR: In several locations, both before and after the sentencing, you have said that the Alexandria trial would have a disastrous effect on the U.S. Could you tell us what you see that effect being, and whether there is any way to do something about it?

LaRouche: A good example of the influence on the foreign interests of the United States is the case of the impact in Europe. In West Germany for example, Austria, Switzerland, and elsewhere, the judge in Alexandria was characterized by knowledgeable circles, close to or in government, as comparable to the famous Nazi judge Freisler of the 1930s and 1940s. I think it's not an unfair comparison, but it was interesting to me that it would be volunteered by people as their immediate reaction to what they knew of the case.

The problem in Europe as such, as far as the effect in the United States goes, is around the proposal to more or less dissolve the sovereign borders among European states, under the title of what is called Europe 1992. The British are determined that shall work out to their advantage, to which effect they have put continental Europe under virtual British economic slavery. The U.S. is presently allied with those British interests against France, Italy, Germany, and other nations. And naturally, the French, Italians, and Germans, aren't happy with the United States engaging in this kind of thugery on Britain's behalf. And they reacted to this trial as the last straw.

It persuaded them that the United States may have gone all bad. As a result, there are much stiffer reactions to U.S. diplomacy now, than there were before the news of the trial hit Europe. Inside the United States, of course, this is an impairment of the system of justice. And therefore, to me, to permit such a travesty of justice to occur, particularly against a major figure with some fighting capability, where other people ordinarily could not fight this kind of thing, even to the degree we did, means that the system of justice has failed

and that the next unfortunate to come down the line to get the same treatment is going to find himself in the deep kimchee faster than we did.

EIR: Do you hold any hope of vindication in the appeal process?

LaRouche: There are always honest fellows in the process who may say, I don't care what the pressure is, this is a foul ball decision, and I am going to do something about it, somewhere in the appellate process. That can happen. Otherwise, barring such action, by simply honest judges, who have had their belly-full of this stuff, the political process will influence the ultimate outcome. One can say in summation, that if Gorby goes up, I tend to go down, If Gorby falls, I tend to go up. That's the way I think things will go.

EIR: There are people, not your friends, who have started circulating the story around these parts that your jailing will have the same kind of effect on the organization as the Soviet pullout on the puppet government in Afghanistan: that is, that there will be a collapse and dispersal of the organization from Loudoun County and elsewhere. What is your assessment of that?

LaRouche: These people are cheering for what would be called fascism, which indicates that such people represent a fascist mentality in the County. And they should begin to examine their own pedigrees on that account. But, however, they are wrong on every account. People who think like that are generally very stupid. The Soviets never intend to leave Afghanistan, and have not left, and have not begun to leave, and of their own volition, never will.

EIR: There is currently a trial going on here in Loudoun, directed by the state Attorney General's office and presided over by Judge Penn, which appears to heading towards the same kind of prejudicial result as Alexandria. What would have to be done here to avoid a similar "railroading" as in Alexandria?

LaRouche: It's simply a fair trial. But undoubtedly there will be some political factors in that too. It could go badly. It's possible, but if it does, 99% of the citizens of Loudoun County will find that whatever can be done to us will be done to them next.

EIR: What role, if any, do you now see for yourself in helping steer the Bush administration?

LaRouche: There are some people in the Bush administration or around it who value my opinion—whether they accept it or not—very highly. They like to know what it is, even if they don't follow my advice. Under conditions of crisis, they will tend to have a stronger voice within the Bush counsel and George may have the good sense to say, okay, what my dear friend James Baker III has been proposing is a lot of garbage, and it isn't going to work; maybe I have to listen to what the other fellow says.