

appellants look to this court for the fair hearing required to right this wrong, and pray for the requested relief. Because of the gravity of the prosecutorial misconduct and its continuation, exculpatory information has been hidden and covered up, denying appellants their constitutional rights and constituting a fraud upon this court. Wherefore, appellants request the appointment of a special master . . . to investigate the matter and procure information essential to this court's determination."

The court ignored their appeals for a special master and dismissed LaRouche's appeal of a wrongly denied motion for exoneration without even so much as a hearing on the evidence.

### Virginia judicial atrocities

Meanwhile, on Nov. 4, 1993, Roanoke, Virginia Circuit Court Judge Clifford Weckstein sent four political associates of Lyndon LaRouche to prison for decades, for securities law violations that normally result in minor or suspended sentences. Weckstein, who makes no secret of his close association with the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (ADL), acted in a particularly vengeful manner during a three-hour sentence-reduction hearing and then ordered Anita and Paul Gallagher, Laurence Hecht, and Donald Phau to state prison with sentences of 39, 34, 33, and 25 years, respectively. With all their appeals exhausted, the four political prisoners were led from the hearing to prison.

The four had been tried and sentenced in Judge Weckstein's court in 1991 on charges of "securities fraud," after the state of Virginia determined *retroactively* that political loans were "securities," making it a felony to solicit such loans without a broker's license. At the heart of these Virginia cases is the scandal of how the ADL induced a prosecution and a judge into action on the basis that they desired the LaRouche movement to be considered illegal, and therefore that any fundraising for it is a crime. They argue that it is a money-making machine, not a political movement, as a way of trying to stop the very ideas that so threaten them. At the sentence-reduction hearing, defense attorney Gerald Zerkin presented the reality that the multi-decade sentences prove that the defendants are being "persecuted, not prosecuted."

As various Virginia newspapers have noted, Judge Weckstein acted in defiance of public policy, as expressed by 13 members of the Virginia General Assembly who had written to advise him that these sentences were excessive, when compared to the sentences of the notorious white-collar criminals Michael Milken, Ivan Boesky, and Charles Keating.

The latest judicial atrocities of Weckstein come on top of his engineering the 77-year sentence of their co-defendant, political prisoner Michael Billington, who in September 1992 began serving his unheard-of sentence, which has shocked even Russian human rights activists familiar with the worst abuses of totalitarian regimes.

## Inman ouster was run by Pollard's pals

by Jeffrey Steinberg

Forty-eight hours before Adm. Bobby Ray Inman withdrew as President Clinton's defense secretary-designate, the London-based Arab-language newspaper *Al-Ashraq Al-Aswat* published a story datelined Washington reporting that right-wing Israeli lobbyists, including National Security Council Middle East specialist Martin Indyk, were behind a no-holds-barred effort to force the four-star admiral's ouster.

While the source for correspondent Fanan Al-Badrawi's story has not been identified, events that followed, including Inman's dramatic Jan. 17, 1994 press conference in Austin, Texas, make it clear that indeed it was the efforts of the neo-conservative, i.e., right-wing Zionist lobby, apparatus that prompted Inman's startling decision and his public blast at the "new McCarthyism."

Inman hit hard at *New York Times* syndicated columnist William Safire, one of the Anti-Defamation League's (ADL) media mouths. Inman catalogued a 12-year witchhunt by Safire and accused the *Times*'s poison pen of colluding with Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole (Kan.) in targeting both himself and President Clinton.

Within days of Inman's withdrawal, Safire all but admitted that the allegations were accurate in a Jan. 22 interview with National Public Radio's Daniel Schorr. Schorr, who proclaimed himself an "FOB" (Friend of Bill Safire), asked Safire about the Inman allegations that he interceded in 1981 with then-CIA head William Casey to override a ban on Israeli unfettered access to U.S. satellite reconnaissance data. While denying that he had intervened, Safire retorted that Inman, then Casey's deputy at the CIA, and Casey had battled over fundamental issues of U.S. national security philosophy. "Casey believed that the Soviet Union was America's number-one adversary," Safire said, "and Inman believed it was the Israeli Mossad."

Safire said that he would devote much of his attention to the Whitewater Development Corp. scandal—the issue that Inman charged was at the heart of the Dole-Safire dirty deal. Even Schorr gagged at Safire's careless admission.

At his press conference, Inman had traced the roots of Safire's hatred of him: "In early 1981 when the Israelis bombed the Iraqi nuclear reactor, I looked at the distance on the map from Israel to Baghdad and thought, 'I wonder how and where they got the targeting material?' We had long-established procedures that in honoring our commitment for Israel's defense, we permitted Israel to requisition satellite

photography of potential direct threats to their systems. When I asked what materials had been drawn under that process for the last six months, I found not only a lot of information on Baghdad had been drawn but also on other countries substantially removed from Israel—Pakistan, Libya. And I made the decision as the deputy director of Central Intelligence, the acting director, to limit the process, to say that in the future they could draw material within 250 miles of the border, but beyond that, they would have to ask.

“The defense minister, General [Ariel] Sharon, was so furious he came to the U.S. to protest to Mr. Weinberger. The secretary of defense supported my decision. Casey had been on a trip down to Australia and New Zealand. When he came back, his favorite journalist and former campaign manager, Mr. Safire, complained to him about the decision. When we had a rather heated discussion, I recommended that Mr. Casey talk to Mr. Weinberger, who had supported me, and he elected not to override the decision. From that point on, if you will trace the [Safire] coverage, it’s been hostile.”

Numerous Washington intelligence specialists have noted that the Inman-Safire-Casey tiff in 1981 was the origin of the Pollard spy affair. Jonathan Pollard himself, in arguing for leniency from the court, had claimed that he undertook

his far-reaching espionage effort to provide Israel with satellite and other technical intelligence data that were being withheld.

It’s no wonder that the neo-conservative crowd became apoplectic when Inman’s nomination was announced. His selection came in the midst of ferocious political wrangling over the fate of Pollard, who has asked for presidential clemency and early release from federal prison, where he is serving a life sentence for espionage. Clinton had been expected to make a decision about the Pollard case before New Year’s, but a public brawl broke out over the case, with a majority of Pentagon and intelligence professionals urging against leniency. News outlets such as *Time* magazine for the first time published long-known data about Israel’s trading of Pollard data with the Soviet KGB in return for liberalization of Soviet laws for Jews to emigrate to Israel.

Even Sharon, who was in the United States on a “private” fundraising mission when Inman withdrew, admitted to a journalist that he had been accused of being involved in the Pollard spy ring, a charge he vehemently denied. As for the 1981 story about his effort to overturn the Inman restrictions on Israeli data access, his only comment was that he had “no recollection” of the incident.

## Is DOJ out of control?

A team of Justice Department career lawyers and FBI agents has been continuing to work on the Whitewater investigation, despite the appointment by Attorney General Janet Reno of an independent counsel who is charged with taking over the investigation and hiring a new staff. This and other developments have led many on Capitol Hill to assert that the permanent Department of Justice apparatus is out of the control of the attorney general, and that career DOJ officials are running amok, doing whatever they want.

At Reno’s Jan. 20 press briefing, the new independent counsel, Robert Fiske, in response to a question about the appearance of a witness before the grand jury, stated: “My understanding is, and I asked this question before I accepted the assignment, that before I was appointed, the Justice Department itself, on its own, had put that investigation on hold until the independent counsel could pick it up and go forward. . . . I am satisfied that it was put on hold some time in the last few days, at least.”

Reno stated: “I instructed the lawyers to make sure that anything should be done that was necessary to maintain the integrity of the investigation, but otherwise it should cease until the independent counsel could be fully

briefed and proceed.”

But on Jan. 22 and 24, after the appointment of Fiske, the *Washington Times* reported that federal prosecutors were broadening their investigation in Little Rock, Arkansas and examining many additional entities beyond Madison Savings and Loan and Whitewater Development Corp. Some of the companies identified as targets of the expanding probe had figured prominently in accounts of secret operations around the Mena Airport which surfaced during the 1992 election campaign, and which allegedly involved Lt. Col. Oliver North’s “Contra” support operations in Central America.

In response to questions from *EIR*, DOJ spokesman Carl Stern insisted that Reno and Fiske were only referring to the appearances of witnesses before the grand jury, and he said that all other activity is continuing. A large number of document subpoenas had already been issued, Stern said, and investigators are continuing to receive these documents, and to catalogue, index, and analyze them. Stern would not respond to the reports of an expanding investigation, but he commented that there are a lot of federal employees in Little Rock working on the case, and they “are still earning their pay.” A team of lawyers from the DOJ Fraud Section had been sent to Little Rock after the local U.S. Attorney’s office had recused itself from the Whitewater-Madison probe.—*Edward Spannaus*