

The 'overt acts' of Lyndon LaRouche

by Ralph de Toledano

The following article, by Copley News Service-syndicated columnist Ralph de Toledano, has been made available to EIR. The trial of Mr. LaRouche and six associates is slated to begin in Alexandria, Virginia, on Nov. 21, 1988. Except for the new charge of "conspiracy to defraud the IRS," to which Mr. de Toledano devotes his commentary, the Alexandria case is a carbon copy of the Boston case against LaRouche and associates, which ended in a mistrial last spring due to rampant government misconduct.

I have been reading Count No. 13 of the indictment of Lyndon LaRouche. I thought I had reached the pits years ago, when I studied one of Roy Cohn's flights into legal fancy . . . but I don't know whether to laugh or to shudder at No. 13—no matter how one may feel about LaRouche. And I feel that the U.S. Code should be amended to give recourse to those caught in the toils of ambitious or weak-kneed law enforcement officials.

The core and the crux of Count No. 13 are the 51 "overt acts" listed to sustain a "Conspiracy to Defraud the Internal Revenue Service." A first-year law student could have a ball ripping apart those "overt acts," but my readers can judge for themselves.

For example, No. 6 of those "overt acts" charges that "on or about Nov. 24, 1980 . . . defendant LaRouche filed a 1979 individual tax return." No. 7, however, states that "on or about Nov. 24, 1980 . . . defendant LaRouche failed to file an individual tax return for the calendar year 1979," as double-jointed an accusation as you will find in legal annals.

How else did LaRouche conspire to defraud the government?

No. 9 says he did not cash a "royalty check" from a publishing house. Scratch at that one. But let's go on.

No. 22. "On or about Dec. 24, 1983 Dana (Sloan) Scanlon purchased a winter parka for Lyndon LaRouche with a \$141.41 check written on her personal checking account."

No. 23. "On or about Dec. 24, 1983 Dana (Sloan) Scanlon purchased a winter parka for Helga LaRouche (Lyndon's wife) with a \$158.84 check written on her personal checking account."

I guess those friends who accepted Christmas presents from me and did not declare them as income were conspiring

to defraud your friendly IRS agent.

Campaign expenses

But let's go on to more serious matters. Late in 1979, Lyndon LaRouche was campaigning for the Democratic presidential nomination in New Hampshire. As is always the case, the expenses for this were paid by his campaign committee. LaRouche was not alone. Other candidates whose expenses were paid include Jesse Jackson, Nelson Rockefeller, George Bush, Walter Mondale, Jimmy Carter, Michael Dukakis, and Gary Hart—to name but a few.

In the case of Lyndon LaRouche, the rules do not apply. Overt Act No. 1 states: "On or about October through November 1979, Citizens for LaRouche, the 1980 campaign committee, paid \$4,926 for Lyndon LaRouche's residence in New Hampshire."

They got off cheap, it seems to me—but then, LaRouche does not live as high off the hog as some other candidates I could name.

Overt Act No. 17 is a shocker, demonstrating the depravity and dishonesty of Lyndon LaRouche, and I quote: "On or about April 1983 defendant LaRouche traveled to Leesburg, Va. and visited Woodburn Farm."

Think of it, he traveled to Leesburg and *visited* a farm. If memory serves me, at around the same time, I traveled to New York and visited my aunt. How is that for an "overt" act?

But this is only for starters.

No. 38. "On or about Aug. 14, 1985, Richard Magraw charged a \$39 pair of cufflinks for Lyndon LaRouche on Magraw's Visa card."

And 10 days later, the same man had the temerity to make a present of a pair of shoes to Helga LaRouche. That shows how one criminal act leads to another.

Ordinary people can receive gifts of up to \$10,000 a year in cash, with no tax liability—but not Lyndon LaRouche. Receiving a 40 buck pair of cufflinks? Horrors!

Enter Henry Hudson

Now it is true that LaRouche lives on a farm in Leesburg owned by one of the organizations to which he is affiliated. But the Internal Revenue Service has had sworn accounts of LaRouche's income and has made no effort to lean on him until U.S. Attorney Henry Hudson, a Dukakis Republican I am told, decided to do away with him. A long trial in Boston ended in a mistrial after it became apparent that the misdeeds charged against LaRouche had been committed by FBI agents attempting to set up a sting operation.

Now the taxpayer will have to pay for a repeat performance in Virginia, this time led by the great legal navigator, Henry Hudson. The first Henry Hudson sailed up the river named after him on the good ship *Half Moon*. Am I being overly flippant if I suggest that today's Hudson, on dangerous legal water, might call his ship the *Half Goon*?