

Abraham (R-Mich.) introduced legislation in the Senate which would deny visas to high-ranking Chinese government officials “involved in political and religious persecution,” and would require U.S. representatives at multilateral development banks to vote “No” on all loans to China, except those related to famine, national disaster relief, and environmental protection. The bill would also impose targeted sanctions against companies run by the Chinese People’s Liberation Army, and mandate stricter enforcement of the ban against sale of Chinese products produced by prison labor. If such provocative legislation were to pass, it would effectively sabotage U.S.-Chinese relations for some time to come.

Another measure, “The Freedom from Religious Persecution Act,” sponsored by Paul Mellon’s favorite, Rep. Frank Wolf (R-Va.), would impose automatic sanctions on a country as soon as there were indications of “religious persecution.” The measure was proposed shortly after a visit by Wolf to China’s Xizang region (Tibet), where he claimed to have found “religious persecution” by the Chinese authorities.

Protests have also emerged against nuclear cooperation. On July 31, sixty-four congressmen signed a letter to Clinton calling on him not to certify that China is not proliferating nuclear weapons. “No President has thus far been able to certify that this is the case,” reads the letter, “and we do not believe that it is possible to certify that it is the case today.” The letter refers to earlier allegations about the sale of ring magnets to Pakistan, an issue that was long ago cleared up, and Chinese construction of a conventional nuclear reactor in Algeria, referring vaguely to “press reports” which “suggested” that this reactor “could have been intended” for the production of nuclear weapons materials. The letter was signed by a bipartisan group that includes China-bashing Republicans such as Wolf, but is also supported by liberal Democrats, such as House Minority Whip David Bonior (D-Mich.) and Minority Leader Richard Gephardt (D-Mo.), a Presidential hopeful who also opposed MFN for China.

Various “donorgate” scandals, alleging Chinese attempts at illegal campaign funding in the United States, have also slowed down momentum on China policy. As one administration official put it, “We were actually relieved when the investigations began shifting from the ‘China track’ to an ‘Indonesia track,’ since this temporarily took the heat off of China, and allowed us to get back to work in trying to implement a China policy.” But GOPers seem intent on hammering away at the “China track.”

Despite continual sniping, the administration is making every effort to move the relationship forward, which is of a decisive character for the future of the world. Extensive negotiations are ongoing to sew up the loose strands in the areas that will play a prominent role at the summit — economic and scientific cooperation, fighting terrorism and drugs, and environmental agreements. And, with progress over the next few weeks, there may even be some surprises coming out of the summit.

Weld goes down; hopefully, to stay

by Edward Spannaus

A major disaster in U.S.-Mexico relations has been averted, as former Massachusetts Gov. William Weld gave up his quest to become U.S. ambassador to Mexico on Sept. 15. One can hope that Weld, who resigned as governor to play out his puerile confrontation over the nomination, will now withdraw from public life and retire to a life of tennis or beer-drinking, or whatever he does best.

But, there are a few who won’t give up. Former White House pollster Dick Morris, for example, has repeatedly floated the incomprehensible idea that Clinton should appoint Weld as U.S. Attorney General, to replace Janet Reno.

We therefore review here Weld’s sordid record as a federal prosecutor, in the interests of helping to prevent him from ever again being put in a position of public trust or authority.

Weld’s ‘priorities’

It was not only Weld’s support for legalization of marijuana that did him in. It is known that opponents of Weld’s nomination were also examining his entire, abysmal record on drug prosecutions. As an indication of what could be expected both in the United States and Mexico, the Mexican daily *Reforma* ran a two-part series on Weld in early September, charging that Weld’s lax enforcement and cover-ups of drug-trafficking and money-laundering had helped to create Mexico’s current drug crisis. Among those quoted was former Senate Foreign Relations Committee investigator Jack Blum, who cited Weld’s role when he was head of the Criminal Division in the Department of Justice (DOJ), where Weld repeatedly obstructed the U.S. Senate investigation into the relationship between the Central American Contras and drug-trafficking.

Weld’s first major law enforcement position was as U.S. Attorney for the District of Massachusetts, which office he occupied from 1981 to 1986; in the summer of 1986, he was nominated as Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division at DOJ headquarters.

When Weld was the chief federal prosecutor in Massachusetts, his office ranked near the bottom in the entire nation on drug prosecutions. When this was raised during the 1996 Senate race in Massachusetts, Weld first tried to claim that the region had “less drug activity” than the rest of the country. However, the *Boston Globe* then published statements from Weld made in internal DOJ memoranda in the early 1980s, in

which Weld said that drug use was “widespread” and “at virtually epidemic proportions” throughout the state.

When confronted with this during the 1996 campaign, Weld declared: “Public corruption was my No. 1 priority.” A former DOJ official said, “When Bill Weld was U.S. Attorney, everyone knew he was a bear on public corruption.” All this, while it was documented that local police and law enforcement officers regarded drugs as the top law enforcement problem in the state.

When Weld says “public corruption,” what he actually means is “political targetting”—which was well known at the time.

As soon as Weld became U.S. Attorney in Boston at the end of 1981, he launched an attack on Boston’s Mayor Kevin White, who was at that time the nation’s longest-tenured mayor. Weld’s crusade against White was later characterized by the *National Law Journal* as “a textbook example of a prosecutor misusing his powers to bully witnesses and manipulate the political process.”

Weld never succeeding in indicting White, although he drove him from office. The highest-ranking official of White’s machine ensnared by Weld was White’s top fundraiser, Theodore Anzalone. Anzalone was indicted by Weld’s team, which included a prosecutor who later handled the first phase of the LaRouche case for Weld—Daniel Small.

At his 1984 sentencing, Anzalone said that he had been harassed by Weld’s “relentless investigation,” and he asked the judge not to put him in jail “for crimes I haven’t committed or been charged with. This is not Russia, Your Honor.”

The U.S. Court of Appeals agreed with Anzalone. In July 1985, the Appeals Court reversed Anzalone’s conviction, in a stunning rebuke to Weld. The court explicitly compared Weld’s methods with the Soviet legal principle of “crimes by analogy,” citing Article 16 of the U.S.S.R. Criminal Code. “We cannot engage in unprincipled interpretation of law, lest we foment lawlessness instead of compliance,” said the First Circuit Court of Appeals.

While Weld tried sending Anzalone to prison for vague currency violations involving \$100,000, Weld negotiated a sweetheart plea bargain with the Bank of Boston, involving more than \$1 billion in explicit currency violations, in which the Bank of Boston was permitted to plead guilty to a one-count violation, and nobody went to jail.

Target: LaRouche

Weld’s second major target was Lyndon LaRouche. Weld opened a federal grand jury against LaRouche’s campaign committees on the eve of the 1984 elections; an FBI teletype at the time stated: “United States Attorney, William F. Weld, Boston, advised on October 31, 1984 that he wishes to move expeditiously in this matter since it affects the integrity of the presidential election process.” Weld’s only problem was, despite the collusion of the major Boston banks, he couldn’t come up with any evidence. In February 1986, Weld at-

tempted to make up for this by convening a nationwide “Get LaRouche” conference made up of local, state, and federal law enforcement officials from across the nation; an FBI teletype announcing the conference stated: “William F. Weld, U.S. Attorney for the District of Mass., Boston, Mass., is extremely interested in this case and has encouraged other U.S. Attorneys across the country to develop their own cases. . . .”

In October 1986, Weld, by then at Justice Department headquarters, coordinated a 400-man armed raid on offices operated by associates of LaRouche, combined with plans for a bloody assault on LaRouche’s residence, which was only halted by LaRouche’s direct intervention to President Reagan. It wasn’t until late 1987 that the mega-trial of LaRouche and a group of his associates commenced in Boston. But despite all of Weld’s efforts, he simply had no case—which was dramatically shown when a mistrial was declared in May 1988, caused by weeks of mid-trial hearings on prosecutorial misconduct. The jurors, who had been sitting on the case for six months, took an informal poll among themselves, and agreed that they would have acquitted LaRouche and the others on all counts.

A *Boston Herald* article on May 5, 1988 opened: “Jurors in the Lyndon H. LaRouche trial said yesterday they would have found him innocent. . . .” The jury foreman was quoted as saying: “We would have acquitted everybody at this point, and that’s based on prosecution evidence. There was too much question of government misconduct in what was happening in the LaRouche campaign.”

The Bank of Boston plea bargain

While Weld was pursuing his “political corruption” priorities, he was protecting his friends and relatives in the banking and drug-money-laundering business.

In 1985, Weld perpetrated a shameless cover-up of a major money-laundering case involving the Bank of Boston and Credit Suisse/White Weld—both banks tied to the Weld family. As to what was involved in the Bank of Boston case, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury John Walker testified in March 1986 before a House subcommittee: “There’s every indication that the \$600 million of small bills which the bank took in was the laundering of drug money. Why else would the money be in \$20 bills?”

Yet, with Weld in charge, the case became a national scandal, as the Bank of Boston was let off with a \$500,000 fine, for \$1.2 billion (!) worth of money-laundering violations.

Then, when Weld went to the Justice Department headquarters in 1986, he protected the drug-smuggling networks operating under the direction of Vice President George Bush and Bush’s flunkie Oliver North.

Yet, because few people were exposing this record, Weld has had the temerity in recent weeks to actually boast of his credentials as a drug prosecutor. Hopefully, this country has seen the last of him.