1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS
3	X
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
5	cr. 82-269-01-N
6	EDWARD JOHN HASBROUCK :
7	Defendant :
8	X
9	마르크 (1) 이 프로그램 (1) 이 프로그램 (1) 이 프로그램 (1) 이 프로그램 (1) 이 크림, 라크 (1) 이 프로그램 (1) 프로그램 (1) 프로그램 (1) 크로그램 (1) 프로그램 (1)
10	마르크 (1985년 - 1985년 - 1 - 1985년 - 1985 - 1985년 - 1985
11	BEFORE: HON. DAVID S. NELSON,
12	District Judge, and Jury
13	Courtroom No. 6 Federal Court House
14	Boston, Massachusetts
15	December 15, 1982
16	
17	APPEARANCES:
18	FOR THE GOVERNMENT:
19	ROBERT S. MUELLER, III, ESQ. ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
20	에 있는 사람들이 많아 많아 보고 있다. 사람들이 되었다는 것이 되었다는 것이 없는 것이 되었다. 그런 사람들이 되었다는 것이 되었다는 것이 없다는 것이 없다는 것이 없다는 것이 없다는 것이 없다. 
21	FOR THE DEFENDANT:
22	EDWARD JOHN HASBROUCK, Pro Se and BENJAMIN HILLER, ESQ.,
23	Assistant Counsel to Defendant
24	마이 마이크 보다 되었다. 그리고 있는 사람들은 사람들은 사람들이 되었다. 그리고 있는 사람들은 사람들은 사람들은 사람들은 사람들은 사람들은 사람들은 사람들은
25	에 보고 있다. 그런 그는 그는 그는 그를 가장 하는 것이 되었다. 그는 그는 그는 그는 그는 그를 가장하는 것이 되었다. 그는 그를 가장하는 것이 되었다. - 그는 그는 그는 그는 그는 그는 그를 가장 하는 것이 되었다. 그는 그는 그는 그는 그는 그는 그는 그를 가장하는 것이 되었다. 그는 그를 가장하는 것이 되었다. 그는 그를 가장하는 것이 되었다.
	[

## I N D E X

Testimony of:	Direct	
FOR THE GOVERNMENT:		
Lawrence Nivison	70	
Robert Collings	73	
Newton E. Crawford	원 (179) 전에 그런 학교를 모르는 것이다.	
David Cox		
Laurie Stoffel		
Richard Templar	92	
	93	
		Page
Motion for standby cou		
Wofigu for Agraes of a	uspension of Rule 53 - Denied	20
	stay proceedings - Denied	21-35
Lobby conference		36-57
Jury impanelment		
Opening statement in b by Mr. Mueller	ehalf of the Government	57
Opening statement by t	he Defendant	65
Government rests		93
Closing argument in be	half of the Defendant	94
by the Defendant	이번 앞에 보이다 하면 이 아니라 있었다면 가게 되었다.	
	half of the Government	102
by Mr. Mueller	그리는 이 사는 사람들이 하는 것 같아 없다면 하나 있다.	
Judge's charge to the	Jury	105
BX	IBITS IN EVIDENCE	
No.		
		71
	보면 보다 왕이는 기업을 보고 있습니다. 전기를 다시 생활성 기업을 기업을 받는 기업을 보고 있습니다. 기업을 받는 것이다.	72
		76
		80
그를 하셨다. 그 활성 없었다.		81
5		84

## 1 December 15, 1982. IN OPEN COURT 2 3 THE COURT: Good morning. THE CLERK: CR 82-269. United 5 States of America versus Edward Hasbrouck. 6 Would counsel identify themselves for 7 the record, please. 8 MR. MUELLER: Robert Muller, for 9 the United States. Good morning, your Honor. 10 THE DEFENDANT: Edward John 11 Hasbrouck, defendant. 12 MR. HILLER: Benjamin Hiller, 13 assistant counsel to Mr. Hasbrouck. And this is 14 Susan Stern who has assisted Mr. Hasbrouck in 15 the presentation of the memorandum which was 16 filed on Monday. And she will be advising him 17 as to that motion. 18 THE COURT: Okay. 19 Now, there are some pretrial metions. 20 One is a motion for the appointment of stand by 21 counsel, but that's not required here. Is that 22 correct? I mean you are not appointed, you are 23 now engaged by the petitioner? 24

MR. HILLER: That's correct.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm still requesting, 1 and the motion is still before the Court, to appoint 2 Mr. Hiller at Government expense as standby 3 counsel, since I am indigent. And I have filed the necessary supporting financial affidavit, 5 establishing my indigency with the Court. THE COURT: As I understand the 7 rule, however, the financial affidavit seems to 8 9

be in order. And you say you signed it, and this is in all cases true. The rule is that you would be represented by the public defender's office.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Does the Government have any objection to the appointment of someone other than the public defender?

Not really, your MR. MUELLER: Honor. Although, as the Court pointed out, the public defender --

THE COURT: Okay. Then I'll allow the appointment of Mr. Benjamin Hiller under the circumstances, subject to all the limitations of fees and requirements for filing responses.

> I understand. MR. HILLER:

THE COURT: Now the next motion that we have is a waiver for suspension of Rules of Criminal Procedure, 53.

And I take it the defendant's wish is to be heard on that.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: I'll hear you.

filed a memorandum of points and authorities in support of this motion with the Court, prepared with the assistance of counsel. I'm not going to reiterate that brief. I think it sets forth more clearly in greater length and in more precise legal language the argument than I could present it, not being a lawyer. I hope that you will look to the brief in ruling on this motion, and not hold against me whatever inability to answer detailed questions of legal particularities in this legal argument.

THE COURT: Well, you can have counsel at the side bar. Do you want to discuss it?

THE DEFENDANT: I have discussed it with my standby counsel in advance in preparing for the argument. I would prefer to speak for myself.

At this time I would like mainly to

stress to the Court the seriousness, both of this motion to me and to the Court and the system of justice, the underlying issues that it raises, the Court to take very seriously the question of openness of the trial, and have taken this to the point where that openness and whatever means can be used to facilitate that openness are presumed absent, a compeling interest or a competing constitutional right.

As we cited in the brief from United States v. Cianfrani, our law strongly favors the presumption that all adjudicated proceedings are open to the public. This presumption is rooted deeply in our common law heritage. explanation from that heritage I think is amply given in Globe Newspapers and in Richmond. And, as we also cite in Richmond, there's a lengthy discussion in Richmond the essence of which is at the very foundation of the right of access recognized in Richmond Newspapers, namely the presumption of openness inheres in the very nature of a criminal trial under our system of justice, 448 U.S. at 573, being quoted faverably in the Globe Newspapers at 2622 in the Supreme Court.

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The Courts take seriously the right of the defendant to a public trial to the point where prejudice is presumed where that right has been restricted, even without a specific showing of specific prejudice due to the violation of that right in a particular case. In the First Circuit case we cited in the brief, Martineau v. Perrin, prejudice to the defendant is implied whenever the trial judge lacks substantial justification for denying or limiting the Defendant's Sixth Amendment claim.

This is a serious matter, I hope you will take it seriously, and claims asserted by the defendant under the Sixth Amendment of a right to a public trial are not likely to be dismissed.

and the reason that it is taken seriously, in the second point, is the fundamental character of this right, and its integral relationship as a fundamental right to the defendant and its integral relationship to the system of criminal justice and the jury trial. The rights to a public trial, as it is explained at length from the historical example in Richmond and Globe newspapers, derives from the

notion of the citizenry out of which arises the jury trial. And this notion of openness at the trial and accessibility of the trial to all those members of the public to whom it can be made accessible without infringing other rights, arises from the same source and its development parallels the origins of the jury trial out of a system in which all of the body of citizenry in the community were regarded as jury, and were trials of fact. And I think the citations in the brief make it clear the importance of that right to, and that continued openness to guaranteeing that the jury trial continues to function in the manner it was intended, allowing the citizenry to function as jury.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Quoting again from Richmond, at 2825,

Supreme Court: "While media representatives"

-- excuse me -- "Instead of acquiring

information about trials by first hand

information or by word of mouth from those who

attended, people now acquire it chiefly through

the print and electronic media. In a sense, this

validates the media claim of functioning as

surrogates for the public." A presumption of

openness inheres in the very nature of a

criminal trial under our system of justice.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

One of the demands of a democratic society is that the public should know what goes on in courts by being told by the press what happens there, to the end that the public may judge whether our system of criminal justice is fair and right. Instead of relying on personal observation or reports from neighbors as in the past, most people today receive information concerning trials through the media, which draws out the point that with the evolution of technology, a judicially recognized evolution in technology, and specifically electronic technology incorporated into the doctrine of the Supreme Court in Chandler v. Florida, the media now play, specifically the electronic media, an essential role in guaranteeing a defendant a public trial, in guaranteeing that the openness and accessibility of the trial serve the purpose and perform the role they are intended to play in a system of jury trial and in guaranteeing the fundamental rights of the defendant.

What I'm seeking in terms of the relief sought by this motion, it is entirely consistent with the judicial trend exemplified in the

Massachusetts Rules, cited in the brief, exemplified in Florida rules at issue in Chandler, exemplified in many other states which have permitted and do permit electronic coverage in various forms and to varying degrees of criminal trials, even where the defendant has objected, rather than as here -- and I think this distinguishes a large amount of the case law on the point -- that this is being asserted by me as my right as a defendant, and thus questions of objections of the defendant which were crucial in many of the adverse decisions on admission of electronic media to the courtroom are clearly distinguished from this one.

what I'm seeking is entirely consistent with the unrebutted, and the rebuttal would require a clear showing of a competing constitutional right or a compelling state interest, which could not otherwise be served without abridging my Sixth Amendment right to a public trial. The unrebutted presumption of the openness of a criminal trial -- and it is entirely consistent with the general principle articulated and I think given particular

expression in Chandler, and I think it's something also developed in other areas of law beside the question of trial openness -- that constitutional rights are to be interpreted in light of circumstances, and in particular in light of the current state of the technology which exists to further and to facilitate those rights.

1

3

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There is authority for the Court to grant the relief sought. I think within Federal Rule Criminal Procedure 53 and local Rule 29 there is authority for the Court to grant the relief sought within the inherent supervisory authority of the Court, which supervisory authority exists to safeguard precisely the sort of right I'm asserting here and which inherent supervisory authority of the Court serves as the source of authority for those rules themselves. I refer you particularly to United States ex rel. Bennett vs. Rundle, 419 F2d at 607, referring to the Pennsylvania Rules of Criminal Procedure, stating that the relevant language of those rules at the time of trial was identical. When application for relief is made a judge of the court shall hold the court hearing in the

presence of only the defendant, counsel for the parties and officers and necessary witnesses. And the Court decision of the Third Circuit comment on this, that the rule is framed in language apparently mandatory. But the evident purpose of the rule requiring the extradition of the public from the hearing is to protect the defendant. This can readily be accomplished by other means, without depriving the defendant from his right to a public trial on the claim that his protection requires this, despite his objection.

claim or practical justification for a departure from the constitutional requirement from a public trial must be tested by a standard of strict and inescapable necessity. It is also clear and established law that where a statute or regulation can be construed constitutionally without requiring it to be invalidated as unconstitutional, it should be. And I think there is an available construction of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure and their source which gives the Court the authority to grant the relief sought. But, of course, if the

Court finds that the rules do not in fact allow for it, the discretion within them to grant the relief sought, to the extent this relief is my constitutional right, then I would think you would be obliged to find that those rules are themselves invalid as overbroad.

I'm not asking the Court to set a new course in uncharted waters. I think there is ample guidance, again in the Massachusetts Rules, in the Florida rules, and in the other precedents that we have, and a good deal of experience that we now have with electronic coverage at trials to guide the Court in structuring the relief in such a way as to preserve the underlying fairness of the trial, which is after all the reason that the public trial right exists.

Thank you.

THE COURT: I'll hear you.

MR. MUELLER: Well, your Honor, what Mr. Hasbrouck I believe is saying is that he wishes the Court to elevate to a constitutional right the right to have microphones and cameras in the courtroom. And quite clearly that is not a constitutional right, never has been, and I doubt whether it will be

in the future. But what Mr. Hasbrouck does 1 have is a constitutional right to a public trial. 2 And, for the record, I might point out to the 3 Court that the press is here in ample numbers. In fact I count ten in the jury box. Anyone, 5 I'm informed by the marshals, who wish to attend this trial, has been given a seat in the 7 courtroom. Mr. Hasbrouck requests his 8 constitutional right to a public trial. 9 being given his constitutional right to a public 10 trial. That does not include necessarily 11 microphones and cameras. And what the rules 12 state, the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedures 13 and the local rule, is that microphones and 14 cameras are the only two devices not allowed in 15 the courtroom. 16

So, in summary, your Honor, I feel that the motion should be denied. Mr. Hasbrouck is entitled to a public trial and is indeed going to get one.

Thank you.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Do you have need for any rebuttal?

THE DEFENDANT: Just a few words.

Essentially I think the response of the

Government ignores the root of the argument that I am making here. It does not attempt to deny or to rebut the essential presumption of openness and the extension of that presumption to all means which are available which can enhance the Sixth Amendment Right to a public trial without interfering with the orderly administration of justice. It attempts neither to rebut that presumption nor to deny that it exists.

The Government's argument also ignores,

I think, the technological change, acknowledged
in Chandler and in the state rules, permitting
television coverage. It ignores that
technological change which has made the
participation of the people through the media
essential to their participation, and their
symbolic participation and access has made the
media essential, given that state of technology,
to the constitutional right itself. I think the
Government has failed to deal with the arguments
that I presented.

THE COURT: I am prepared to rule

I want to say this in preface to my
ruling.

First of all, of course, both counsel

both the defendant petitioner here and the 1 Government -- has had an opportunity to argue 2 this clearly in front of all here present. I 3 note the presence of the media, and any of the media who wish to be here, whatever discipline 5 they may come from -- electronic, TV, radio, newspapers. In fact I too note that at least 7 ten representing the media are present, and two 8 of them at least are taking pictures, and all 9 the others seem to be taking notes. 10 THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, lest 11 12 there --

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Let me just finish.

THE DEFENDANT: I was just going to say "sketches" rather than "pictures", to make it clearer or the record.

THE COURT: Well, "pictures" is what I said. And you can take exception to my findings.

And again, of course, notes. I also can point to the presence of a stenographer court reporter, who I hope is diligently taking down all matters presented to her. And indeed that she has a tape recorder available, so that all that is being said is also being taped. And

in this case I will make it clear that that tape is available to you, if necessary.

I note also that I ordered that we attempt to get a courtroom large enough to accommodate anybody who wished to come and view the trial, a very difficult thing to do because of the tight scheduling of trials here, but I was able to do that in this instance. And I know that there is space for others, if others wish to attend, this being the largest courtroom available, the largest courtroom in the building.

so I cannot honestly say that the media is so limited in its coverage as to give rise to any constitutional claim, indeed even to give rise to any question, substantive question at least, of indeed unfairness. I can only suggest that, mindful that as a citizen and interested party, I would personally be open to allowing electronic media with all its equipment and so forth in the courtroom under proper and appropriate guidelines, but I'm compelled, and correctly so, to deny your motion in light of local Rule 29, and the standards set down in local Rule 2, and, of course, Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure Rule 53.

1 2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I can't say honestly, therefore I would suggest that there is in my mind no element of unfairness, but for the lack of tape recorders and cameras in this courtroom. I don't know how it would enhance the truth that hopefully will be elicited from a trial on this particular issue. And in only a limited way will it affect people who are not in this courtroom, such that their opportunity to understand the issues and understand what's going on and what has gone on because, of course, there is apparently going to be wide enough coverage and other things available. So the absence of that doesn't give rise to any major restriction in the process of this trial. And, since the rules proscribe it, I will concede to the rules, and your motion is denied.

THE DEFENDANT: I would like to first put on the record the fact that still and videotape cameramen and people bearing electronic sound recording equipment were barred, and are being barred from the courtroom. And having put that on the record --

THE COURT: You're saying just the equipment is barred, not the people?

THE DEFENDANT: The equipment.

~ ;

and I certainly would find that as a fact; that nobody in this courtroom, other than the Court Reporter, has the opportunity or a right to have any electronic equipment for the purposes of taping or taking pictures of, or anything else. It is a violation of the rule. And if so I will eject them from the courtroom with their equipment and bar them, as well as their equipment, from coming into the courtroom.

THE DEFENDANT: I would also like to put on the record that the normal procedures of this District Court do not permit the sound recordings made by the court reporters, the electronic recordings, to be replayed publicly or broadcast or copied. That's my understanding.

for that purpose. They will be used for the purposes of making sure that the record is in fact accurate and as correct as it possibly can be done. Only for that purposes, really. So you will have an epportunity to check to see if the record, the Court reporter's notes, are

correct when they are produced.

THE DEFENDANT: Having done that,

I would ask the Court to acknowledge that this
ruling is a final order, the ruling you just
made is a final order within the meaning of U.S.
Cede 28 Section 1291 as interpreted in Cohen vs.
Beneficial Industrial Loan Corporation, 69
Supreme Court, 1221, and as that doctrine was
applied to criminal cases by Abney vs. United
States, 97 Supreme Court --

THE COURT: Well, the response to your request is denied.

THE DEFENDANT: Therefore, that request being denied, I would move the Court for a stay of these proceedings to permit a petition to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit certifying this question as an appeallable order within the meaning of 28 U.S. Code Section 1291, and the taking of an interlocutory appeal.

THE COURT: That motion is denied.

No stay will be permitted.

All other rights will be saved though for appeal after the fact. If you are convicted, then that will be a matter for appeal. If you

are not convicted, I'll take the matter as moot. 1 Any other preliminary matters? 2 THE DEFENDANT: There was, I 3 believe, a pretrial conference scheduled for this morning. I don't know whether you want to 5 do that now in chambers 6 THE COURT: Yes, I would like to 7 do that now. And let me just make sure, for all 8 those who may not understand, I suppose, is that 9 in every single case, criminal or civil, it has 10 been consistently every single time, without 11 exception, my practice to attempt to have 12 counsel and the parties discuss with me the 13 proceedings that are to take place. And I am 14 prepared to do that now in my chambers. 15 There being no objection thereto, we 16 will recess to the chambers. 17 18 (There was a recess.) 19 20 (Lobby conference.) 21 22 THE COURT: First of all, is 23 24 everybody ready? THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 25

MR. MUELLER: Yes, your Honor. 1 THE COURT: And now, the real 2 question is there's a jury ready, they are 3 prepared. I want to ask this consideration. Is 4 there any unlikelihood, put it that way, that 5 the case won't be completed today? 6 THE DEFENDANT: I assume it will 7 8 be done teday. MR. MUELLER: I would expect so. 9 Because, I tell you THE COURT: 10 this. It will be very difficult for me, such 11 that if we can't finish it today the only time 12 13 we can resume is Monday. THE DEFENDANT: Well, I don't know 14 how long the jury will take on that. To me 15 that's the only --16 THE COURT: The only issue I want 17 to make sure is that it gets to the jury. 18 Whenever it gets to jury, from there on there is 19 no problem. 20 THE DEFENDANT: It will get to the 21 jury today, I think. 22 THE COURT: Let me go down the 23 list of witnesses 24

I understand that the government has

1	six witnesses?
2	MR. MUELLER: We have
3	THE COURT: Why is Magistrate
4	Collings
5	MR. MUELLER: Mr. Hasbrouck, when
6	Mr. Collings was still in the U. S. Attorney's
7	office, Mr. Hasbrouck came in and saw Mr.
8	Collings. And at that time he told him he did
9	not register, would not register, and gave him
10	also certain documents to be introduced into
11	evidence.
12	THE COURT: Do you have any
13	difficulty with that? My hope would be that it
14	will not be necessary to have Magistrate
15	Collings. But, if it is
16	THE DEFENDANT: He is a material
17	witness. But I hope that he will come in mufti
18	and not judicial robes.
19	THE COURT: No problem. He's not a
20	magistrate or a judge on the witness stand.
21	THE DEFENDANT: Fine.
22	THE COURT: Except, though,
23	whatever is pertinent to the role he was playing
24	at the time. But the issue is whether he did
25	those ministerial things. You say there's an

issue of whether he did it or whether he had a 1 right to do it, or something of that sort. 2 you follow me? THE DEPENDANT: He's a material witness to relevant facts to the case, which I 5 think he's the only person to properly б 7 establish --THE COURT: I know that. I know 8 that. My 9 MR. HILLER: May I have a moment? 10 THE COURT: Yes. 11 ( Attorney Hiller conferring with 12 the defendant client.) 13 MR. MUELLER: If I could just 14 explain for a second. Mr. Collings will testify 15 as to certain statements made by Mr. Hasbrouck 16 to him and to certain documents that Mr. 17 Hasbrouck gave to him. 18 I understand all of THE COURT: 19 that. My problem only was that would there be 20 any denial on your part of what statements you 21 made to him, or any conclusion that there were 22 23 some statements made?

THE DEFENDANT: I think it's simply a question of the government's burden of

24

1 proof and obligation to satisfy it --

THE COURT: Here's what I'm after, and I just want to see whatever I can do to make the trial run smoothly.

was whether there was a traffic light on the corner, sometimes the parties will agree there was a traffic light on the corner. The issue is whether or not it was red or green. So we don't need somebody to come in and testify that there was a traffic light on the corner. But I think we have to have the person to testify it was red or green, because I said it was red and he said it was green.

So the question to you is simply, do you have anything to contradict? Would you contradict anything that Mr. Collings would testify to?

THE DEFENDANT: I don't intend to present any defense at all. I don't intend to stipulate, if that's what you are saying -THE COURT: Okay. That's what I

want.

THE DEPENDANT: The Government will have to satisfy its burden.

THE COURT: Okay. No problem.

And now you need all of these witnesses.

Do you need Lawrence Nivison?

MR. MUELLER: I don't really need Lawrence Nivison. He was going to put on a certified copy of the birth certificate and the motor vehicle license for establishing the date. And I was going to put him on because he's a person that will present them to the jury. He will not be testifying --

THE COURT: I don't know if you call that a stipulation or not. But if we can go through the mechanics of putting that in one way or the other.

MR. MUELLER: And save a witness.

In other words, the birth record he's going to

put in, apparently your birth record. Right?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, the point is one of the documents he was going to put in, furnished to me on mandatory discovery by the Government, there was at least one inaccurate statement about that document.

THE COURT: Well, he's not going to testify about the document, he's just going to put them in. So he won't be making any

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MUELLER: Just that he picked

them up from the appropriate state agency.

THE DEFENDANT: I would like to see some evidence of where they came from.

THE COURT: Okay. And then you say

Yes, your Honor. MR. MUELLER:

How about Templer? THE COURT:

Let me go to Edward MR. MUELLER: Crawford, down the list. Edwin Crawford is from Selective Service in Washington. He was the one who remembered seeing the letter that was sent by Mr. Hasbrouck to the Government indicating he would not register. So he will testify as to that. He will also testify to a letter that was sent to Mr. Hasbrouck requesting that he do register.

Going down the list. Mr. Cox and Ms. Stoffel and Mr. Templer are all from the computer records service of the Secret Service, and they will jointly testify. Mr. Cox will testify to the procedures for storing the records and Mr. Templer and Ms. Stoffel will testify that they did a search and did not find Mr.

1	Hasbrouck's records within those computer records.
2	THE COURT: Okay. Now, do you have
3	any witnesses?
4	THE DEFENDANT: No.
5	THE COURT: Do you intend to take
6	the stand?
7	THE DEFENDANT: I don't intend to.
8	I'm not entirely ruling it out, but I don't
9	intend to.
LO	THE COURT: All right.
11	MR. MUELLER: Can I mention one
12	other matter as a preliminary matter?
13	As far as the exhibits are concerned, I
14	have shown Mr. Hasbrouck the exhibits that we
15	intend to introduce. I have, after talking with
16	your clerk, lettered them A through G.
17	THE COURT: A through I.
18	MR. MUELLER: Well, I have a new
19	list which is A through G. I left out a couple.
20	THE COURT: All right.
21	MR. MUELLER: And Mr. Hasbrouck
22	did indicate to me in the pretrial conference
23	that he would not oppose the admission into
24	evidence of those exhibits, but was unwilling to

So I guess the best procedure, as far as the exhibits are concerned, is for me to introduce them in the course of the case and see what position Mr. Hasbrouck takes on them.

Is that a fair statement?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MUELLER: I would like to also point out to the Court one matter relating to voir dire.

THE COURT: One moment.

Okay.

MR. MUELLER: I indicated in the pretrial statement I believe to the Court that Mr. Hasbrouck had had an opportunity to review the voir dire proposed by the Government, and that he had made suggestions as to how that might be better written. I did not mean to mislead the Court. Mr. Hasbrouck had seen one or two of the questions but did not have an opportunity to review all the Government's voir dire, and the suggestion was made only to one question only.

Se, Mr. Hasbrouck, correct me if I'm wrong, has not had an opportunity to.

•

- -

THE DEFENDANT: After you filed them I saw them. I haven't filed any objections to them, so I don't really think that's an issue.

THE COURT: Well, the question I

have is -- Let me put it this way to you.

The only questions I can guarantee that I'll ask at this point in time are the ordinary and statutory questions dealing with bias and all that. Now the problem is that -- I mean the goal, as far as I'm concerned, is whether it is possible to obtain -- the goal is to obtain a jury that at least is, as best we can, without much to-do, determine that they have no reason, there is no reason for excluding them from sitting on the jury.

And so, I haven't studied all of these questions very carefully, but in a way I don't want to develop as it were partial jurors. I want to see impartial jurors. And so, as I go back over these I'll tell you which ones I will not include, or the converse, which ones I will include. Maybe there are some that might give me some difficulty.

What voir dire questions to you have?

THE DEFENDANT: None.

THE COURT: All right. The next
thing is, since it's going to be a one day trial
I propose to seat only twelve people in the box.
I take it there is no reason, as far as I'm
concerned, for an alternate juror.

MR. MUELLER: I would hate to have to go through it again, your Honor.

THE COURT: Perhaps if there are sufficient jurers to seat one additional, perhaps we could. If they are getting --

The biggest problem only is -- I mean to me the alternate jurors make some sense when the rule, as in the state court, for example, allows them to be used at a future time. But I'll decide that as we go along. We'll see. But at the present time I intend twelve jurors, but we'll see.

Any other pretrial matters?

THE DEFENDANT: One thing that I wanted to bring up, because I think it is a minor matter, and can better be dealt with here. I have a great deal of difficulty as a matter of conscience with standing for the judge when he or she comes into the courtroom --

THE COURT: Let me put it this way.

There are no rules right now, as far as that is concerned. You can stand or sit if you want to.

The only rule that I have at the moment is one of civility, that's all.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.

THE COURT: And I don't want any other issues or unnecessary issues to be raised. It's not an issue in my mind. As far as I'm concerned you conducted yourself decently, and whether or not you stood or not, I don't know, but it went off well. I want to be able to do my thing without artificial pressures. That's what I want.

MR. HILLER: I have one matter
to raise and it is a little bit out of the
ordinary, but I'm raising it as an officer of
the court, not as his counsel. That is my
concern that it is going forward, based on Judge
Hatter's decision in California, which makes
this proceeding improper. And I would raise
that to the Court. If the Court would like a
copy of Judge Hatter's decision --

THE COURT: I know it. It is not a binding precedent.

MR. HILLER: And it was as a

б

model, it was raised by me personally, not by Mr. Hasbrouck's counsel. And I want to make it clear, it isn't a motion.

THE COURT: I understand.

THE DEFENDANT: I think what Mr.

Hiller is tryi g to point out as a jurisdictional question something of which the Court may take cognizance and acknowledge its lack of jurisdiction, based on the invalidity of the rule itself under which the charge is brought. The Court is required to take cognizance of whether or not there is a motion by the parties, unless the issue is before the Court, regardless of a motion by the parties.

THE COURT: Well, I take it that the issue isn't before me. But, in any event, even if it is I intend at least at this moment, until better schooled, advised, or convinced, then there is in my mind a presumption of the validity despite other rulings by another judge. The fact of the matter is that there were things presented to him out of context that may or may not differ from this, and this has not been fully represented to me. In any event, there is always the advantage of a trial and a post trial

proceeding, if that proves necessary. 1 In any event, I recognize that you have 2 made as an attorney, citizen, as you call yourself, 3 and interested party in that respect, you have made an attempt to bring the issue before me in 5 this limited way. 6 MR. HILLER: And if you would 7 like to have an extra copy of the judge's 8 decision. 9 THE COURT: Okay. Great. 10 (Handed over.) 11 MR. MUELLER: One last question 12 on the schedule today. We'll pick a jury now, 13 and does the Court plan to take a lunch break? 14 Yes. As a matter of THE COURT: 15 fact, I had something arranged, but I will drop 16 it. If possible I would like to move along. 17 MR. MUELLER: I would like a 18 little break to bring the witnesses up from 19 20 our THE DEFENDANT: I think the most 21 feasible thing is to have the lunch break occur 22 once we have the jury chosen. 23 THE COURT: What I'm anxious 24

about, you have all kinds of assistance to go

1	down there.
2	MR. MUELLER: I wish that was the
3	case. And Mr. Collings asked, since he will be
4	called, that perhaps he be alerted 15 minutes
5	before.
6	THE COURT: Is he going to be the
7	first witness?
8	MR. MUELLER: The second witness.
9	THE COURT: And the first one
10	will be how long?
11	MR. MUELLER: Five minutes.
12	THE COURT: Maybe they can both
13	come up.
14	MR. MUELLER: I would hope so.
15	But I need a break to call him, because he's not
16	at my beck and call
17	THE COURT: Let's go and choose a
18	jury and we'll work from there.
19	THE DEFENDANT: Thank you for your
20	consideration
21	(End of lobby conference.)
22	
23	IN OPEN COURT
24	
2 5	(Turn panel entered the courtroom at

1130 a.m.)

THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

All right. Good morning ladies and gentlemen.

ALL: Good morning.

THE COURT: Okay. Very good.

There's a rule, I don't know if other judges

abide by the rule, but I require that we have

live jurors.

(Laughter)

that I have is I am told that your job is to listen very carefully to the evidence and use your judgment and to abide by the rules, and all that sort of thing. And the first test of that is to see whether you are alive, and the second test is whether you will speak and the third test is whether you are listening. So when I say Hello or Good Morning, you be nice to me and respond.

so I believe I saw everyone respond to my questions, so therefore I find as a matter of fact that you are all qualified to serve, up to a point. And now we are going to be in the

process of trying to establish it and go beyond that point. That is, whether there is some reason why you shouldn't serve on a particular jury that we are now about, the trial that we are now about to begin.

I'm going to introduce a few things to you, and I'm going to tell you a little bit about this trial, very little about it, and I am going to put some questions to you. And the questions that I put to you are designed and based upon the information that I give and the information that you have to determine whether or not you are: (1) qualified to sit on this jury; or (2), that the parties and the Court are satisfied that it would be appropriate for you personally to be on this particular trial.

That if you do not, if you are not chosen, or in fact you are originally selected and then you are asked to step down, you should not take this as a personal affront. Whatever the process is, and so it is designed simply to find twelve of you who are capable and willing and open to the rules, the laws of this Court and nation, to sit on this particular trial and decide very very

important issues in this trial, decide a very very important case.

It is a criminal case, and so, of course, we have to look at it very very seriously and attentively, and we have to look at it with utmost fairness and regard for the rules.

Now, this case is entitled the United States versus Edward J Hasbrouck. I believe that's spelled H-a-s-b-r-u-c-k. Mr. Hasbrouck is the gentleman that sits right there, to my left. He will be representing himself in part and he will be assisted by an attorney, Benjamin Hiller, the gentleman that just stood.

And Mr. Hiller is from Boston; is that correct?

MR. HILLER: Cambridge.

THE COURT: That's a good place.

And representing the Government here is Mr. Robert Mueller, spelled M-u-e-l-l-e-r, the third. And he is, of course, associated with the United States Attorney's office here in Boston.

My name by the way, because I know you want to know, is David Nelson. And I will be

presiding, of course, throughout the trial.

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, this is a criminal matter which the Government brought and got an indictment against the defendant, Mr. Hasbrouck, and alleged simply that Mr. Hasbrouck failed to register with the Selective Service as they claim is a requirement of the law. If you sit on this jury you will have to determine whether as a matter of law and fact Mr. Hasbrouck has failed to register with the Selective Service and is guilty or is not guilty. The requirement of proof of that claim will be upon the Government. And I will be very careful to explain to you what that burden is and what the nature of that proof has to be in order for the Government to prevail.

Now, there will be several witnesses called during the course of it. Of course the allegation is that this offense was committed from July 27th, 1980 and continuing to the present. That is, since July 27th, when allegedly he was ordered to do so, in 1980 to the present, Mr. Hasbrouck has failed to to do so and is in violation of the law. Again that's something that the Government has to prove to

1 you.

Some of the witnesses that may be called are one Special Agent Lawrence Nivison.

He's from where, please?

MR. MUELLER: I believe he's from this area; Boston.

THE COURT: Boston. All right.

And one Edwin Crawford, a Selective Service

agent --

MR. MUELLER: He's an administrator with the Selective Service System in Washington, D.C.

THE COURT: And one Robert B.

Collings, who, at the time that this matter occurred, was a member of the United States Attorney's office, and now has a different capacity.

And then one David Cox, who is in the administrative division of the Selective Service in Washington, D.C. One Richard Templer, T-e-m-p-l-e-r, of the Selective Service in Chicago, Illinois. And one Laurie S-t-o-f-e-l, Stoffel, of the Selective Service Administration in Chicago, Illinois

Now, essentially I'm going to ask you

1 questions such as: Whether you know anybody involved in this case; do you know any of the 2 lawyers; any of the parties. Do you know any of 3 the witnesses; have you been associated with any 4 one of them in any way, you, or any member of 5 your family, any close relative, any close 6 friend involved or friends of or associated with 7 or at odds with any one of these witnesses or 8 any of the parties involved, or any of the agents 9 of particularly the Selective Service agency in 10 this case? If your answer is no, then you need 11 not respond at all, and I will take it that your 12 answer is no. If the answer is yes, you simply 13 have to raise your hand and I will recognize you 14 and we will have a conference at what we call 15 the bench or the side bar, or at least off to my 16 left, and we will find out what information you 17 have and then decide what to do about it. So 18 you need not speak in front of everybody else, 19 so that hopefully you won't be limited then in 20 what you are willing to tell me to make sure 21 that we could be satisfied that the information 22 doesn't impel you to be dropped from the jury. 23 I'm going to ask you such questions as 24 to whether or not you have had any involvement

in this area. Questions perhaps about your attitude, whether negative or positive, or do you have any at all in regard to the Selective Service or any particular law of the United States that's related to this. Have you had any experience this way. Anybody in your family have any such experience? Does any one of you have any of this pending?

Now none of those questions necessarily will remove you from the jury, but it's important for us to have knowledge of that so that we can make appropriate judgment about it.

I'm going to ask you such questions as do you have any ideological feelings about this situation one way or the other -- for the draft, against the draft, for Selective Service, against Selective Service -- or any other kind of thing that may be pro or anti-government as such that you think should be brought to my attention, and indeed especially if you think that it may in some way affect your judgment.

I'm going to ask you, therefore, essentially the questions. They all go to whether or not you are aware of any particular bias or prejudice that would affect your

judgment. When I ask you if you have any bias or prejudice, my question doesn't stop then. If you don't have any biases or prejudices then I don't want you sitting, because you won't have any judgment, I suppose. What I want to make sure about is that those biases, whatever they may be, or prejudices, whatever they may be, or prejudices, whatever they may be, does not in any way interfere with the possibility of you being fair, open to the rules and to the evidence as presented to you.

Your job will be during the course of this trial is to listen very very carefully to the evidence, and I will fully explain where the evidence comes from, and based only on the evidence, not on anything that happens outside of this courtroom, not any of the other things that you may have thought about or believed in before, essentially, but on the evidence. And then you will decide the facts from that evidence, and you will decide the verdict in conformity with those facts and in conformity with the instructions of law that I give you.

The one essential responsibility that I have is to explain to you the law. But it doesn't begin to measure up to what your

responsibility is, and that is to decide fairly and squarely the facts and the verdict. So, since you have a heavy responsibility, I would ask you then to be very very frank and open and genuine in your responses to these questions.

. 1

Now, in a moment we are intending to choose only twelve. If I feel it necessary I will choose another one. I might offer this to you. That I don't know that the case will take more than one day. So, if that's a factor in your ability to serve, then you ought to have that in mind. So with this, I think we can -- with this out of the way I think we can now begin to chose the jury.

JUROR: May I speak to you?

THE COURT: Give me a second. I

want to hold you up for a moment until I see.

What I'm going to do is -- here's what we are going to try to do. We don't have much room in the courtroom and I don't think we need any more room if we all cooperate with this idea. I know it's a good idea because I thought it up

There are twelve of you who will be seated, so I believe if you go down 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, those are the twelve

seats where the jurors that are chosen will sit. He's going to pull the names of twelve people 2 out. When he has done that, then I want those twelve people to sit in those twelve seats and the others will have to do a little put of unmusical chairs to get to other spots. We'll see if we can do that. If it doesn't work we'll start over again.

> Seat one, juror 74; THE CLERK: seat 2, juror 34; seat 3, juror 48; seat 4, 77; seat 5, juror No. 88; seat 6, juror No. 91; seat 7, juror 86; seat 8, juror 85; seat 9, juror 84; seat 10, juror 83; seat 11, juror No. 82; and in seat No. 12 juror No. 81.

> THE COURT: Now, if you are sitting in those twelve seats and your number wasn't called would you move out and just stand right over here. That's fine. Now will juror 74 please sit at this seat right there, jurer 34 in the next seat, juror 48, juror 77, juror 88, juror 91, juror 86, juror 85, juror 84, 83, 82, 81.

Once more, the last one will be 81. Then 82. Okay. That's good.

I have 74, 34, 48, 77, 88, 91. Then I

23

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

1

have 86, 85, 84, 83, 82, 81.

Now, gentlemen can you all see the jurors, and I'm going to get them to respond to the questions.

Now to you twelve jurors /-BS and of course all the others will have an opportunity to listen so they can respond to the questions.

The first question: Does anyone have a need to ask me a question regarding this matter? Come to the side bar one at a time.

(Side bar discussion, as follows...

JUROR NO. 74: Marie Chiampa, No. 74. I saw on the media last night I saw Mr. Hasbrouck. I don't know whether or not that would bias me or not. But I did see it on the news.

THE COURT: Well, I'll ask you the question. It's one thing to see it on the news and the other is whether or not as a result of that you would be unable to listen to the evidence and based only on the evidence determine the facts in a way that I explain it to you, the way that I explain the law to you? JUROR 74: Okay. I am opposed to

the draft and I think it would affect my

б

7

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

1	decision.
2	THE COURT: All right
3	Any problems about her stepping down?
4	MR. MUELLER: If she is for cause.
5	THE COURT: Okay. You may step
6	down.
7	JUROR 84: Joseph Hanlon, No.
8	84.
9	THE COURT: What's your question?
10	JUROR 84: I live in the same town
11	as the defendant, and I think there could be
12	mutual friends. I don't know him.
13	THE COURT: Do you know him or his
14	friends?
15	JUROR 84: I do. I think there's a
16	mutual friend.
17	THE COURT: Who is that?
18	JUROR 84: Mr. Clayton, I believe
19	he knows.
20	THE COURT: Well, does that make
21	any difference to you?
22	JUROR: It doesn't make any
23	difference. I just wanted
24	THE COURT: Would it effect your
25	judgment in any way?

JUROR 84: No. 1 THE COURT: Would you be willing to 2 listen to the evidence and based on the evidence 3 and the law determine your verdict? 4 JUROR: Yes. 5 THE COURT: So you don't know of 6 any other thing then to make it clear to us? 7 JUROR 84: Just that I live in the 8 9 same town. MR. MUELLER: May I ask one 10 question. I ask the Court to ask the gentleman 11 whether or not in his conversations with the 12 mutual acquaintance Mr. Hasbrouck has come up, 13 has been a topic of discussion? 14 JUROR 84: There was an article in 15 the local newspaper that we did discuss. 16 THE COURT: And did you discuss pro 17 and con about it? 18 JUROR: No, just that it was 19 20 there. THE COURT: Okay. I'll be asking 21 other questions of the other jurors about media, 22 so you can respond to those questions as 23 necessary. 24

25

JUROR 86: Gregory Hills, No. 86.

time he did.

THE COURT: What's your question?

JUROR 86: I have read about it in

the paper and I have a biased opinion. I had applied for the Selective Service at the same

THE COURT: And?

JUROR 86: And I hold a biased opinion about the case. My feeling is about the Selective Service, complete opposite to him.

THE COURT: Does that affect your judgment as to what happens in this case?

Okay. All right. Any reason? I'll let him go if nobody objects.

THE DEFENDANT: No. I have no objection to people who register for the draft. I think people that registered for the draft are preeminently my peers.

THE COURT: Let me ask you another question. The process of the trial is that we try to pick jurors, not jurors in favor of or against or not for, but people who would be willing whatever their prejudices and biases, mindful that we all have prejudices and biases, is whether or not for this important exercise that you would listen carefully to the evidence, and

1 if the evidence establishes a certain fact to you then you would vote that way. After hearing 2 all the facts and deciding on what the facts are 3 with all the other members of the jury you would 5 decide a particular verdict, you would be deciding on it based on the facts and you would 6 be putting aside any prejudices or pros or cons 7 8 before you came in the courtroom to see justice Much like what would happen I suppose in 9 the military, you would follow the orders and 10 try to do what's best under the circumstances, 11 but using your own judgment and conscience in doing 12 that. Do you understand that? 13 JUROR 86: Yes. 14 THE COURT: Do you think you could 15 follow the rules in this case? 16 JUROR 86: My opinion that I have 17 had 18 19

MR. MUELLER: Your Honor, let me-THE COURT: Do me a favor, please,
I have to hear these people.

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Noise in courtroom.)

JUROR 86: I have the opinion for two years. It is fairly strong, I don't know if I could set it aside that easily. I don't think

it would be fair to them that it is that biased. 1 MR. MUELLER: Even if Mr. 2 Hasbrouck does not move for his cause, I'll move 3 for his exclusion for cause. It appears that he would not be fair to both sides. 5 THE COURT: All right. I'm going 6 7 to let him go. Thank you. MR. MUELLER: 8 JUROR 34: I don't know if it is 9 the appropriate time. Carmen Lennington, Jr. 10 11 No. 34 I do have a definite bias I think 12 against the defendant, unless I could be 13 persuaded otherwise. I just wanted to be frank 14 about that. 15 THE COURT: Well, here's the 16 process. The process is simple. Is that it is 17 understood that people come in with prejudices 18 and biases. You are a human being. The problem 19 is one of which the question is if I tell you 20 would you be capable and be willing to listen to 21 the evidence, and if the evidence shows one 22 thing and it may or may not be consistent with 23

what your bias is, that you would find

accordingly. Are you prepared to do that?

24

1	JUROR 34: Yes.
2	THE COURT: Now she's expressed
3	what she has to do. How do you feel to that?
4	THE DEFENDANT: I'm not objecting
5	to any of jurors.
6	MR. MUELLER: I would like to ask
7	one further question. She indicated a bias. Is
8	it against the defendant personally
9	THE COURT: No, just in principle.
10	MR. MUELLER: Thank you, your
11	Honor. That's all.
12	
13	IN OPEN COURT
14	
15	THE CLERK: The following take
16	seats Nos. 1 and 7. Seat 1 juror 78; seat 7
17	juror 37.
18	THE COURT: Now have either of you
19	reason to see me?
20	Come up.
21	(Side bar discussion, as follows
22	JUROR: John Autrey McGlynn, No.
23	37.
24	THE COURT: What's your question?
25	JUROR: My son is in the United

States Air Force.

THE

JUR

should know this.

THE

difference to -
jurors over and o

important. The q

determining the p

for each of the j

whatever bias or

THE COURT: So?

JUROR 37: I just thought that you

THE COURT: Does that make any difference to -- I'm going to explain to the jurors over and over again, and it's very important. The questions really go to determining the possibility and the willingness for each of the jurors to do this. That is whatever bias or prejudice or experience that you have had, the question really is whether you are willing for this purpose to put them aside, listen very carefully to the evidence and based on the evidence decide the facts in conformity with all the other members of the jury, and decide from the facts and the law as I tell it to you whether or not the defendant is guilty

Are you able to do that?

JUROR 37: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay

Any questions?

24 IN OPEN COURT

б

THE COURT: Now, the twelve of you -- of course I want all the others to listen very carefully so that if necessary you will be able to respond to the questions if called upon later on more easily.

I'm going to ask you now does anyone of the twelve of you have any reason or know of any reason why you should not serve on this particular jury? And the answers all appear to be no.

Any one of you know anybody involved in this case? You, or any member of your family, related to, associated with, work for, work against, anybody or any entity, anybody in this case? And the answers would appear to no.

Anyone of you seen any of this, this particular case or any case like it that comes quickly to mind regarding this subject matter or the defendant or the United States Government in this particular case? Anyone of you seen anything on the TV or news media about this? The answers, other than what is recorded, appear to be no.

Any one of you ever formed or expressed an opinion regarding this particular case? And

the answers would appear to be no

Any one of you ever have any strong or lasting opinion about Selective Service, the draft, the military, the defense, such that that opinion may obstruct or interfere with your ability to listen to the evidence, and based only on the evidence as it pertains to this particular case, determine a verdict based upon that evidence and on the law as I express it. Do any one of you have any particular difficulty about doing that? And the answers all appear to be no.

Any one of you had any member of your family that was subject to the laws of the Selective Service and the rules surrounding them and had any difficulty about that, or expressed any difficulty about that? And the answers would appear to be no.

Essentially what I'm attempting now to find out from you is whether by reason other than what will be presented to you in this courtroom you would have reason to believe that you would not be able to adequately serve and abide by the rules of law as I lay them out to you? The answers would appear to be no

I find that these jurors stand indifferent. 1 THE CLERK: Side bar 2 3 (Side bar discussion, as 4 tollows... 5 THE CLERK: Any challenges, give 6 7 them to me. THE DEFENDANT: I have none. 8 MR. MUELLER: I have none. 9 ... end of side bar discussion.) T C 11 THE COURT: Well, it appears that 12 the rest of you wasted my time. We have a jury. 13 I want to thank you very much for being in 14 attendance, and hope that you get to serve 15 another 50 days in the jury system. If you have 16 any problems let me know. But I think you can 17 go home now. Is that right? 18 (Remainer of jury venire left 19 the courtroom.) 20 21 THE COURT: I chose not to have 22 alternates because I would like to have all of 23 you know and fully understand that you will be 24 the ones that will sit on this jury. You will 25

have to be very attentive to all that you hear and very attentive to the law. I want you to know that the law requires a unanimous verdict, so I have to rely upon you for that kind of diligence and interest and care so that we can determine whether or not you can fully agree with each other on the facts and on the verdict. So you have several things to do, including listening very carefully, observing the rules and staying healthy so we won't loose anyone during the course of the trial.

1.0

Again, I think that we might be able to conclude it today. We'll try to make it as comfortable as possible.

I would like to give you some preliminary instructions right now and then we are going to take a break. Whether that break is for lunch or otherwise I'll let you know after I have conterred with counsel. But perhaps it my be wise to give you some preliminary instructions as to what is going to happen.

You heard me tell you what the basis of the allegations are. You will have with you in the jury room what we call an indictment. The

1

2

3 4

5

6

7

9

ΤO

1 1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

indictment will spell out more specifically what the charge is, and I will read that to you now.

it says, in part, that beginning on or about July 27th, 1980 and continuing to the date of return of this indictment within the District of Massachusetts -- and the return of this indictment I believe was October 6, 1982 Edward J. Hasbrouck, the defendant herein, a male person required to present himself for and submit to registration pursuant to: (1) The Military Selective Service Act; (2), the rules and regulations adopted pursuant to that Act; and (3), Presidential Proclamation 4771 of July 2nd, 1980, did knowingly and willfully fail, evade, and refuse to present himself for and submit to registration in violation of Title 50 of the United States Code and the pertinent sections thereto.

so that's essentially then what the defendant is being charged with. And, as I said to you before, and this is very very important to the system of justice, is that once the Government makes that accusation it becomes the responsibility of the government to prove it.

Now, what's going to happen from here

on is the following. We are going to begin when we come back with an opening statement by the Government. That opening statement will be an explanation by him of the things that he intends to prove and the witnesses and the evidence he intends to produce to prove that there has been a violation of this act. And when he is timished with his opening statement the detense has an opportunity at that time, if it wishes to do so, to make an opening statement. It is after this opening statement or both these opening statements are made that the evidence will begin.

The evidence will be produced by the Government at first and the Government will put on evidence. And then, if the defense wishes to, the defense will have an opportunity, it he hasn't already, to make an opening statement. But it he has already made an opening statement will then begin with the production of any evidence the defense wishes to put on.

I will tell you again at the trial, of course, that the defendant has no responsibility of doing anything, certainly no responsibility of putting in evidence whatsoever, because the

innocence. The Government at all times has the responsibility of proving the defendant's guilt to a standard that I will explain to you more

carefully at the end of the trial.

 $\perp \perp$ 

Now, after the prosecution has put in its evidence and after the defense, if it wishes to, puts in its evidence, then the evidence will be closed, and each side will be given an opportunity to make closing statements, we call them closing arguments, or whatever, but in a sense it will be their round up, their summary, and they will attempt to persuade you as to what the evidence proved in this particular case or didn't prove.

After that is complete I will instruct you on the law. I will tell you what specific law applies to this particular case and you will be responsible for abiding by that law. You will then get that instruction, and then you will go out and have an opportunity to deliberate among yourselves in secrecy and determine whether or not the Government has proved its case as brought before you. And then once you have a verdict you will return that

verdict and we will abide and apply, of course,
the verdict as you present it to us.

Now, I want you to know something very important. I want you to know that the only thing upon which you base your determination of facts and then ultimately your verdict will be derived or gotten from the evidence.

what is evidence? The evidence comes to us in several forms. Primarily the evidence will come in through witnesses. Witnesses will be sworn and they will take the stand over there and will testify in response to all the questions put both by the prosecution and the defense. The witness, of course, is sworn to tell the truth and is supposed to tell the truth.

must observe the witness as the witness testifies, and decide what of what that witness tells you you will believe. And two, you will decide how much weight or dependence you will place upon what a witness has told you and from that you will decide certain facts, based upon the witnesses' testimony. The law says that you may believe some of what a witness tells you, or

you may totally dispelieve a witness. And that is entirely, entirely up to you, and no one else. So it's very important for you to listen carefully and observe how a witness testifies. Indeed, here is where the law is brilliant in its making, in that it allows you to use your own commonsense, your own experiences, all that wherewithal that you have to make those decisions. So there is no magical way of doing it, except, of course, making sure that you are very attentive and very honest in your

determination of what a person says to you.

Beyond that, you will have as evidence certain exhibits. Both sides have an opportunity to present exhibits. The Government will put on some exhibits and they will be marked. If they are marked with a number you know that it is in evidence. You will be able to take that piece of evidence back with you to the jury room and give it what weight, what regard, you think it deserves, and based upon that you may find certain facts, and based upon the exhibits and the testimony you may be able to find other facts.

And then you are allowed to draw what

we call reasonable interences, based upon the 1 evidence or any fact that you find to be so. So 2 that here again is the law's expression of its appreciation for your intelligence and ability 4 to think. You will be allowed to draw certain conclusions based upon the fact or facts as you 6 come to know them. So, indeed, if someone testifies to fact A and you believe it, and 8 somebody else perhaps testifies to fact B and Ÿ you believe that to be so, and now since you 10know that fact A is true and fact B is so, then 11 you are allowed, if it's a natural, reasonable 12 interence that can be drawn from facts A and B 13 you can draw fact C it fact C is supported by 14 the existence of facts A and B, even though that 15 may not be directly testified to. 15

so, with that, that constitutess all the evidence or the kinds of evidence that will be presented to you, and it constitutes all from in which you may draw any fact conclusions from.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now what you cannot do, and it's very very important, what is not evidence is very very important. What is not evidence and what you cannot do is you cannot, for example, guess, speculate, surmise, conjecture about anything.

so when I was explaining to you about fact A and tact B, if in fact you knew A and didn't know B, and you say well, I guess B occurred, or I bet you it did, so therefore I can draw a conclusion as to C, that wouldn't be right. Because if whatever you need in order to be reasonably satisfied of the interence is lacking, then you may not draw that conclusion.

You may not fall back on any prejudice or bias that you had in order to make a certain determination. You may not regard anything else that's evidence. So when I say "anything else", I have already told you for example that you are going to hear opening statements, you are going to hear closing statements, you are going to hear instructions from me. None of those things is evidence. So even what I tell you, what expressions I use, what facial expressions I may -- and hopefully they are not undesirable have you are to draw no conclusions from that. They are not evidence and not to be used. What you may have heard outside or seen outside, you can't use that in any way. Just what I told you as far as the evidence is concerned.

There was in this case for example

25

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

something I just read -- an indictment. indictment is not evidence, and therefore has no bearing on what the facts are. It is just a means of telling you, explaining to you what it is that you have to be able to establish beyond a reasonable doubt before you can find the detendant quilty. But that's not evidence, that the accusation was made. The fact that the defendant is brought before the Court and he's called a defendant, or sits in a certain position, or any of those other things, you may not regard. He claims his innocence, and it is not only a right but he's presumed to be innocent until such time as he's proved otherwise. That's something that I will be more clear to you about later. The idea, though, is that all those other things that I talked to you about, the indictment, to the fact of the presence of the claims made, none of those things you will use to decide his innocence or quilt.

Now, I think that brings you to where I want you. That is, the position to understand hopefully what you need to have in mind as you listen and observe the evidence.

25

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1

11

10.

13

14

12

**1** 5

16

17

13

19 20

21

22

23

24

**2** 5

There is one other thing that goes on some times that perhaps you will hear or not hear, and that is objections made. Objections are made for good reason. That is to make sure that whatever happens is consistent with the law. So they are asking me to make a ruling on the law, and I make rulings on the law, and I say Yes, you may have that in evidence, or No, you may not have that in evidence. Whatever I do about it or whatever I say about it is not something that you will consider. The only thing that you will consider is what I do in tact allow into evidence by placing it into evidence. It I make a mistake on that the system has a way of hopefully curing those. errors on my part, and so that is none or your business and it's not important for us right now. But don't hold it against somebody because they object or there is a ruling against or for them. It's not a game played like that.

Now, I want you to abide by two other things. One is that it's important for you, I'm sure we need your attention, I'm sure there will be people talking about it, I'm sure that you may hear things in the corridor and what have

you. I'm going to ask you to try very very nard to avoid any such contact whatsoever. I'm going to ask you that if you in fact come in contact with anything in the media in the course of this trial, or anything said that clicks in your mind elsewhere, that when you come back you simply raise your hand and give me a chance to talk to you up here so that we can assure everybody there is no difficulty involved. That's part of your responsibility too, to have jurors anxious to do justice.

The other thing is that you shouldn't come to any conclusions about this case until it's all over, until I tell you now it's time for you to go out and deliberate. Up to that point in time you don't want to conclude to the innocence or guilt of the defendant, and you should be very careful to adhere to that rule.

Finally, you are not allowed to talk about this case whatsoever. So, don't talk about it with anybody who asks you any questions. It perchance when you go home or perchance you are out on the street or meet with anybody else, you are not to discuss this case in any way with anyone and you are to avoid any conversations

22

23

24

25

That's important. And indeed you about it. cannot and you may not talk about it among yourselves. So if you are on the elevator and you are talking together and you didn't hear something, and you say, Gee, I didn't get that question or answer, you don't ask the other what was said. Or I don't remember what he said, or that sort of business. No discussion about this case once you walk out of that jury box until I give you that instruction, and that it is indeed when you go out to deliberate to a verdict. And you'll be surprised how it works. Because it you haven't already sat on a jury you'll find that there's almost total recollection, if not indeed total recollection of all the evidence by discussing it at that point in time one with the other you'll see the magic of the system that allows for honest and accurate judgment.

So, with that in mind I'll excuse you, ladles and gentlemen of the jury. I'll ask you to go to the jury room right now and then I'll give you further instructions as to whether you should return here or go to lunch.

By the way, my practice is to choose a toreperson at the end. Is there any difficulty

1	with that?
2	MR. MUELLER: None, your Honor.
3	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very
4	much.
5	(The jury left the courtroom.)
6	
7	THE COURT: Do you want to do
8	lunch now?
9	MR. MUELLER: I would think that
10	the jurors may want to take a short break. I'm
11	ready to go whenever the Court is ready to
12	proceed. Maybe a short lunch break would be
13	appropriate at this time.
14	THE COURT: What's your attitude?
15	THE DEFENDANT: It would seem to
16	make sense to go to lunch now and then go right
17	through.
18	THE COURT: How about one o'clock.
19	1:05 to return. Is that all right?
20	MR. MUELLER: Fine.
21	THE COURT: All right.
22	Instruct the jurors for one o'clock.
23	
24	(Lunch recess.)

1	P.M. SESSION
2	
3	(The jury was seated.)
4	
5 · · ·	
6	(Side bar discussion, as
7	tollows
ម	THE DEFENDANT: I just wanted the
9	record to show that I learned during the recess
10	for lunch that at various points during the
11	proceedings this morning there were more people
12	seeking to attend to trial than could fit into
13	the courtroom, and there was a line of people
14	outside the courtroom waiting to get in who
15	could not get in for want of space,
16	end of side bar discussion.)
17	
18	IN OPEN COURT
19	
20	(Oath administered to the jury).
21	THE COURT: All right Ladies and
22	gentlemen, just as I explained to you before, we
23	are now about to begin the trial, though not the
24	evidence. You will now hear from counsel, Mr.
25	Mueller, and he'll make an opening statement.

MR. MUELLER: Thank you, your

2 Honor.

Ÿ

As the Court has indicated to you, my name is Robert Mueller. I'm an assistant to the U.S. Attorney, with the U.S. Attorney's office in this building. It is my responsibility and duty today to present to you the evidence in the case of United States versus Edward J. Hasbrouck.

Now it is a common practice for attorneys at the outset in initially talking to a jury to discuss what an opening statement is and how this trial is going to proceed. The judge has already done that. I'm not going to spend any amount of time doing that.

attorneys in an opening statement to tell you now simple the case is, now uncomplicated and simple the case is. It may be a six month anti-trust case, it may be one of the most complicated cases that's ever been tried, but counsel generally stand up here and tell you that it is simple. Today's case is relatively simple. It is one of the tew occasions where one can find himself in this position and tell

you in all truthfulness that this is a relatively simple case. By being a relatively simple case doesn't mean unnecessarily that it is an unimportant case. It is an important case because you have a defendant before you, Mr. Edward J. Hasbrouck, who faces charges that he must answer to in court before you. The charges -- and 1'll briefly review the indictment -- are that Mr. Hasbrouck failed to register for the Selective Service system.

 $\pm 3$ 

The balance of my opening statement is going to review for you what the Government must prove to you in order to prove the charges in the indictment.

There are basically three items that
the Government has to prove to the jury to
sustain a conviction of Mr. Hasprouck on these
charges. The first is that Mr. Hasprouck had a
duty to register, that he was required to
register. The second element that the
Government must prove is that Mr. Hasprouck did
not register, even though he had the duty. The
third element which the Government must prove is
that Mr. Hasprouck's failure to register was
knowingly and willfully done. Those are the

three items that the Government has to prove to you.

 $\perp 2$ 

now, now is the Government going to present the evidence in the form of testimony and witnesses to prove those three items? The first item, the fact that Mr. Hasbrouck had a duty to register.

Let us start back in 1980, specifically July 2nd, 1980, when then President Carter issued Proclamation 4/71. In that proclamation President Carter, pursuant to the powers granted to him by the Constitution and Congress, stated that all men born on or after January 1st, 1960 were required to register for the Selective Service. And I want to emphasize register for Selective Service, and want you to keep in your mind the distinction between register for Selective Service. That's what the proclamation dictated.

It also stated in that proclamation that those men born in calendar year of 1960 were required to register between July 21 and July 26, 1980. Now over the period of years since July 2nd, 1980, the date of that

the like, but the duty still remains. The duty is that those persons born in calendar year 1950 were required to register between the dates of July 21 and July 26th, 1980, and if they did not do so they were required to register thereafter.

Now register; what does register mean in this context? Registration currently means that the registrant, in this case Mr. Hasbrouck, is required to go to his local post office, and at that post office fill out a form. That form would then be sent to the Selective Service system and a letter of acknowledgement would be sent to Mr. Hasbrouck. The full extent of his outy in response to this proclamation was to walk down to his local post office and fill out a form and then the post office would send it to Selective Service.

Now, proof of Mr. Hasbrouck's duty to register comes in basically two forms. The first is the birth certificate of Mr. Hasbrouck. It will be introduced by F.B.I. special Agent Lawrence Nivison. The birth certificate for Mr. Hasbrouck indicates that he was born on January 11th, 1960. During the calendar year -- or he

nas a birth date of the calendar year in which requires his registration. We will also introduce into evidence his application for a driver's license in the State of Massachusetts which also indicatess a birth date of January lith, 1980. So his birth date falls within that period which requires him to register.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

1 3

14

15

15

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Now the Government's proof will also show that Mr. Hasbrouck did not register. And we will show that in a number of ways. One of the first witnesses you will hear is a former Assistant U. S. Attorney Robert Collings who will testify as to a meeting that he had with Mr. Hasbrouck in the U. S. Attorney's offices in this building on March 1st, 1982. At that time Mr. Hasbrouck asked to see somebody in the ctrice, and he was directed to Mr. Collings, who went out and talked to Mr. Hasbrouck. In the course of that meeting Mr. Hasbrouck indicated to Mr. Collings that he had not registered, and indeed did not intend to register. He also at that time gave Mr. Collings one document, and additional documents -- there will be one document that will be brought to your attention today -- which was a letter that was written

to a number of people in Washington,, D.C., in which Mr. Hasbrouck spells out the fact that he has not registered, will not register, and is aiding and abetting others to avoid registration, and indeed is part of a conspiracy to not register.

2.0

2.3

also produce the testimony of several persons from the Selective Service. One will be a Mr. Edward Crawford, who is an administrator with the Selective Service who remembers seeing the letter which Mr. Hasbrouck sent to the Selective Service, the same letter that Mr. Collings will testify to. He will also indicate that a form letter was sent out to Mr. Hasbrouck. Upon receipt of evidence that Mr. Hasbrouck had not registered a form letter was sent to Mr. Hasbrouck by Selective Service encouraging him to register.

what you might call record specialist. Mr.

David Cox is in charge of the computer system tor the Selective Service, and he will testify as to how the records are kept once the post office feeds the records to the Selective

.

Service system how they are put in either microtiche and/or computer files.

And the final two witnesses will be clerks, one a microfiche clerk who searched the microfiche records for the recordation of Mr. Hasbrouck's registration; and finally the computer technician who searched the computer files for Mr. Hasbrouck's registration. In both cases no registration was found.

That then is the Government's case before you. We believe that the letters that you will see, the statements made by Mr. Hasbrouck to Mr. Collings will paint a picture of an individual who has not registered, will not register, and takes some pride in the position he has taken.

Before I leave you and start putting on the evidence in the Government's case, and before Mr. Hasbrouck has an opportunity to talk to you, let me for a second discuss what is at issue here and what is not at issue here.

What is in issue in this courtroom today and before you as jurors called before this courtroom, is whether or not the facts presented to you are sufficient to make you

together reach the conclusion that Mr. Hasbrouck has violated the law beyond a reasonable doubt.

That is what is in issue here today.

3

number of things. Whether the Selective Service law is valid, whether it is constitutional, whether it is even right. That is not in issue here today. What is in issue here today is the quilt or innocence of the young man to my left.

And I thank you for giving me your attention during my opening remarks and I would ask that you give the same attention to Mr. Hasbrouck not only in his opening remarks but throughout the trial of this case.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Do you care at this time, or counsel care at this time to make an opening statement?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: You may do so. Either or both of you.

THE DEFENDANT: I think Mr.

Mueller has given you a rather accurate

statement of what is legally at issue and

legally not at issue here. It is precisely for

the reason that none of the issues that he has defined as legally relevant -- whether I knew that the Government wanted me to register, whether I registered -- there is no question about those those, I don't think, or any real dispute, and they are not at the heart of what I think you can see are the real issues of registration for the draft.

1.3

The things which Mr. Mueller has defined I think accurately as not being legally at issue here, not being legally relevant are precisely the real issues in the case being brought against the Government by those who have through non-registration avoided the draft.

The purpose of opening statements is supposed to give an idea of how the parties see the case. And I think I can best do it by reading to you very briefly the statement which I filed with the Court before this trial began of my view of the case.

The defendant, myself, charges that continuing to the present the Government did commit acts of patriarchy, war, and imperialism and did conspire to commit nuclear omnicide in violation of the peace and freedom and of the

rights to justice and survival of the people of the world. The defendant indicts the Government for these crimes by his statements and actions. These charges are before and should be publicly tried by the jury of defendant's peers, young mean who are deciding whether to register for the draft. There verdict is their decision whether or not to register. Those who do not register find the Government guilty and sentence it to irrelevance.

entirely irrelevant to the real issues of registration in the draft. I think that nothing that goes on here, and I do expect and assume that I will be convicted so I certainly don't want that, but I realize that given what is defined as the illegally relevant that that's probably what is going to happen, whether I'm convicted, anything that go on here. The parade of government witnesses you will here testifying to irrelevant matters not in dispute, such as I knew the Government wanted me to register and that I didn't register. That is going to have no effect on the real case. It's nothing to have no effect on the millions of other people

who have violated the Selective Service laws who cannot be prosecuted because they didn't write the Selective Service and tell them and make the case against themselves and publicly assume responsibility for what they were doing. What goes on here is irrelevant to the issues as I see them. I have no expectation that even if I tried to present them I would be permitted to. I think Mr. Mueller's characterization of what is legally relevant and admissible is quite accurate. And that is the reason why I'm not going to present a defense, I'm not going to contest what the Government says. I'm not going to have any further part in these proceedings.

Obviously I have to be here, the

Government would have sent marshals to come and

drag me into court if I hadn't shown up here.

But I see a system or the courts as being

integrally related with the system of the draft,

and I teel no more obligation to present a

defense here and prove that what I did was legal.

And I teel an obligation to prove my sincerity

to a draft board to be classified as a

conscientious objector.

I don't know what else I can say. I

y

1.1

hope that you will understand and not be mystified by the fact that 1'm not going to have anything more to do with this proceeding. MR. MUELLER: Your Honor, I would have to, for the record, take exception to the remarks as being outside the proper scope --THE COURT: There are no exceptions taken, counselor. MR. MUELLER: We are ready to proceed with the Government's case, your Honor. The first witness is Special Agent Lawrence Nivison. 1 / 

1	LAWRENCE NIVISON, Government
2	witness, being first duly sworn, testified as
3	tollows:
4	
5	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. MUELLER:
6	Q. Now, Mr. Nivison, you are a special
1	agent with the federal Bureau of' investigation;
8	is that not true?
9	A. Yes.
L 0	Q. And as such you are were assigned as
11	the case agent to the investigation of the
. 2	alleged violations of Mr. Hasbrouck; is that not
L 3	correct?
L 4	A. That's true.
15	Q. In the course of your assignments as
1.5"	the case agent, did you have occasion to obtain
17	the birth certificate for defendant Edward John
1 E	Hasprouck?
19	A. laia.
20	MR. MUELLER: May I approach the
21	witness, your Honor? .
22	THE COURT: Yes, you may. You will
23	not have to have permission to approach the
2 4	witness if you need to.

MR. MUELLER: Thank you.

2.5

1	Q. Snowing you Government Exhibit A, could
2	you identity that for the Court, please?
3	A. It's a certified copy of a birth
4	certificate for the Commonwealth of
5	Massachusetts.
6	MR. MUELLER: May I offer the
7	exhibit into evidence, your Honor.
8	THE COURT: No objection. It may
9	be admitted. That becomes Exhibit 1.
1 0	(Exhibit 1 in evidence.)
11	Q. Could you please, now that that exhibit
12	is in evidence, Special Agent Nivison, that
13	birth certificate is for what individual?
14	A. Edward John Hasprouck.
15	Q. is there a date on that birth
16	certificate?
17	A. Birth date is January 11, 1960.
18	Q. Thank you. Let me show you Exhibit B.
19	And would you please identity this exhibit?
20	A. It's a certified copy of a
21	Massachusetts driver's license.
22	Q. In the name of whom?
23	A. Edward J. Hasbrouck.
24	MR. MUELLER: I offer B into
25	evidence.

THE COURT: Okay. No objection. 1 It may be admitted. 2 THE CLERK: Exhibit 2. 3 (Exhibit 2 in evidence.) 4 Does that registration or that Q. 5 application for a registration also have a date? 6 Birth date is January 11, 1960. A . 7 Thank you, I have no further questions. 8 Q. THE COURT: Any questions? 9 There being no questions you may step 10 11 down. Next witness, please. 12 MR. MUELLER: Is Robert Collings. 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1	ROBERT B. COLLINGS, Government
2	witness, Sworn.
3	THE WITNESS: Robert B Collings.
4	C-c-1-1-1-n-g-s.
5	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. MUELLER:
6	Q. Mr. Collings, in March of this year how
7	were you employed, sir?
8	A. In the early part of March I was an
9	Assistant United States Attorney for the
10	District or Massachusetts.
11	Q. On March 1st, 1982 did you have
12	occasion to talk to a person by the name of
13	Edward J. Hasbrouck?
14	A. Yes, 1 dia.
15	Q. Where did that talk take place?
16	A. In the waiting room at the United
17	States Attorney's office on the eleventh floor
18	of this building.
19	Q. Did you see Mr. Hasbrouck in the Court
20	today?
21	A. Yes. He's seated right there.
22	(pointing)
23	MR. MUELLER: May the record
24	reflect that the Mr. Collings identified the
25	detendant Mr. Hasbrouck.

THE COURT: The jury will observe.

Q. How did it happen that you did have the meeting with Mr. Hasbrouck?

- A. I believe I was requested to see him by Mr. Weld, the United States Attorney. Mr. Hasbrouck had come in to see Mr. Weld who was otherwise engaged, and asked me to speak to Mr. Hasbrouck.
- Q. And where did you go to speak to him again?
- A. In the waiting room at the United States Attorney's office on the eleventh floor of this building.
- Q. What was the substance of your conversation?
- A. Well, I went to see him. He was there with a few other people, maybe two or three, and I told him who I was, he told me who he was.

  And he told me that he wanted the United States Attorney's office and the Department of Justice to know that he had not registered for the draft during the grace period which was about to expire, or had just expired, and he wanted the Department of Justice and the United States Attorney's office to know that it was a

intentionally not registering. And he said that he didn't want the Department of Justice to think that he had neglected to do it or forgotten to do it or inadvertently not done it.

- Q. Did he say anything about whether or not he was talking to other people about his decision not to register for the draft?
  - A. Yes, he did.
  - Q. what did he say in that regard?
- Department or Justice to know that he was encouraging, and the words he used were "aiding and abetting" others who were required to register for the draft not to, and that he was conspiring with other people to keep them from registering for the draft.
- Q. Now at that meeting with Mr. Hasbrouck did he give you any document?
  - A. Yes, he did.
- Q. Let me show you what has been marked as prosecution Exhibit C. Do you recognize this document, sir?
  - A. I recognize the letter.
  - Q. And if you could identify it for the

1	record. It's a letter of what date?
2	A. October; 3 October, 1981.
3	Q. From whom?
4	A. Edward John Hasbrouck.
5	MR. MUELLER: I offer Government
6	Exhibit C in evidence, your Honor.
7	THE COURT: No objection. It may
8	be marked Exhibit 3.
9	(Exhibit 3 in evidence).
10	Q. Now, was a copy of Exhibit 3 given to
11	you at that meeting with No. Hasbrouck?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. Now that is directed to whom?
14	A. Well, it's got nine addressees starting
15	with William French Smith, Attorney General of
16	the United States of America, and ending with
17	Margaret Heckler representative of Congress.
18	MR. MUELLER: No further questions.
19	THE COURT: Does the detense have
20	any questions?
21	If not, you may step down. Thank you
22	very much.
23	MR. MUELLER: At this time I
24	would like to read excerpts from government
25	Exhibit 3.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

**⊥**7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: You may.

MR. MUELLER: This letter to Mr. Smith and it's signed by Mr. Hasprouck.

It states in part: "I was born in Cambridge, Massachusetts, on 11 January of 1960 and with those other men of my age wnom you claim as your citizens, (subjects), in parens, was supposed to register on one of the six days, 21 through 26 July 1980. On 17 July, 1980 at a press conference in Chicago, Illinois, I announced my intention not to register and urged others to do likewise. I continue to publicize my non-registration and to advocate non-registration at post offices in Chicago, Boston and Wellesley, Massachusetts, throughout the July 1980 and January 1981 mass registrations. Needless to say, I did not then nor have I since registered, and my statements to that effect have been published and broadcast throughout America. I have not registered, I have conspired not to, and I have conspired to aid and abet others not to".

Your Honor, the Government's next witness is Edwin Crawford.

THE COURT: He may be called.

2 υ

NO TEXT APPEARED ON THIS PAGE.

PAGE NO. INSERTED IN ERROR.

NEWTON EDWIN CRAWFORD, Government 1 2 witness, Sworn. THE WITNESS: My name is Newton 3 Edwin Crawford, C-r-a-w-t-c-r-d. 4 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. MUELLER: Mr. Crawtord, how are you currently 0. 6 employed? 7 I'm employed in the Selective Service 8 Α. system in national headquarters in Washington. 9 What are your duties there, sir? Q . .  $\mathbf{10}$ I'm a branch chief for program 11 12 evaluation. Let me show you what has been marked as 13 0. Government Exhibit D, which is a letter to a 14 number of addressees, the top one being William 15 French Smith, Attorney General, from Edward J. 16 Hasbrouck. 17 Do you recognize that letter, sir? 18 Yes, I do. Α. 19 And why do you recognize it? 20 Q. Because 1 was in receipt of it in my 21 A . previous capacity in the Selective Service 22 system where I had the job dealing with 23 registration compliance. And this letter was 24

torwarded to me for processing.

1		Q. And that letter is from a Mr. Hasbrouck,
2		and directed to, amongst others, William French
3		Smith. Is that correct?
4		A. Yes, it is.
5		MR. MUELLER: I move into
6		evidence Government Exhibit D.
7		THE COURT: No objections, it may
8		be marked as government 4.
છ		(Exhibit 4 in evidence.)
10		Q. Now the date on that exhibit is 3
11		October, 1981, is that not correct?
1 2		A. Yes.
13		Q. And one of the addressees is James Bond,
14		Acting Director of Selective Service? /
15		A. Yes.
16		Q. And there is also an envelope with that
17		letter in that exhibit?
18		A. Yes.
19		Q. That is addressed to James Bond?
20		A. Yes.
21	,	Q. What is the return address on that?
22		A. 74 Elmwood, E-l-m-w-o-o-d, Wellesley,
23		Massachusetts, 02181.
2 4		Q. Now as a part of your procedures, did
25		the Selective Service upon receipt of that

letter send a letter in turn to Mr. Hasbrouck? 1 2 Α. Yes, we did. 3 Let me show you what is marked as Government Exhibit E, and ask you if this is 4 such a letter? 5 Yes, this is the letter that we sent. 6 MR. MUELLER: 1 move into 7 evidence Government Exhibit E. 8 THE COURT: It may be marked 9 Exhibit 5. 1 C (Exhibit 5 in evidence.). 11 Q. Now without reading the letter, sir, 12 could you explain to the jury the substance of 13 14 the letter? Well, the purpose of the letter is to 15 apprize the individuals whom we determine, 16 because of information forwarded to us, as being 17 18 potential non-registrants. The purpose of the letter is to apprize these individuals of their 19 responsibilities and the penalty for not 20 registering, and to give some procedures on how 21 22 they can register. And it is sent to them by our general counsel of the Selective Service. 23 And such a letter was sent to Mr. 24

25

Hasbrouck?

A. Yes, it was. MR. MUELLER: I have no further questions. THE COURT: Any questions of the defense? There being none you may step down. Thanks. MR. MUELLER: The next witness is David Cox. 

1	DAVID COX, Government
2	witness, Sworn.
3	A. David Cox, C-c-x.
4	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. MUELLER:
5	Q. Mr. Cox, you're with the Selective
6	Service System at this time?
7	A. Yes, I am.
8	Q. What are your duties with Selective
9	Service?
10	A. I'm responsible for the registration
11	records and all the data processing activities
12	for the system.
13	Q. were you involved in the setup of that
14	particular system?
15	A. Yes, I was.
16	Q. Could you move closer and speak into
17	the microphones, if you would.
18	Thank you.
19	Now, could you briefly describe to the
20	jury the procedures by which the registration
21	form is or comes to be filed with Selective
22	Service? /
23	A. Yes, I would be glad to.
24	Q. Okay. And did you bring a chart today

which would assist you in explaining to the jury

what that system is? 1 Α. Yes. 2 MR. MUELLER: Your Honor, we have 3 marked as Government Exhibit F the chart that 4 Mr. Cox has brought today. I would ask it the 5 Court would allow that he be allowed to approach 6 closer to the jury box and explain the system to them. 8 THE COURT: Yes, provided that the 9 detense can see the rendering. 10 (Witness in front of the jury with 11 chart). 12 THE COURT: Perhaps if you show it  $\perp 3$ 14 to me, quickly. Okay. Thank you very much. 15 Now, Mr. Cox, again, would you explain 16 U. to the jury exactly how the system works? 17 A. What this chart depicts is the basic 1.8 process of registration with the Selective 19 Service. There is three parts: what the 20 registrant does, what the postal service does; 21 22 and what Selective Service does. The registrant is required to come to a 23

post office and complete the Selective Service registration card, which is the Selective

24

1 | Service Form 1.

T 8

- Q. Let me show you what's been marked as Government Exhibit G. Is that such a form?
  - A. Yes, this is the registration form.

 $\label{eq:mr.mueller:} \textit{MR. MUELLER:} \qquad \textit{I move into}$  evidence Government Exhibit G.

THE COURT: There being no objection, it may be marked Exhibit 6.

(Exhibit 6 in evidence.)

A. On that form we request their name, their address, phone number, sex, and date of birth, and have them sign the card.

registration card it is given to a postal clerk behind the counter who checks the card for completeness and asks to see the registrant's identification, if they have one, and checks that against the card to make sure that it is correct.

The post office collects the cards.

And the small post offices, they mail them to us every four weeks. In large post offices they mail them to us every two weeks. And we receive them at the data management center in Chicago, Illinois.

. 3 

1.8

when we receive the cards we count everything that comes in, put them into batches or boxes of work, and number every card so we can account for every card which has come into the system.

is on the cards so that we can get it into a tormat that the computer can work with. This is called data entry. Very much like typing, type the information into the small computer.

The second step is data verification.

The same information is retyped and the small computer compares what was typed the first time with the second time so it can highlight any typographical errors. And if there is one the operator can correct it. So, if you were typing my name, C-c-x, and you typed it C-o-y the keyboard would lock and the operator can correct the typing error.

The next step is to process the intormation through the IBM computers. And here we are editing for the correct date of birth, making sure of the correct year of birth, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, looking for the correct sex, a complete social security number, valid

state, a completed phone number; things of this nature. If some of the information is wrong, such as date of birth or sex, the registration is moved to our error file and from there we either send a letter to the registrant asking him to correct the information if it is the error, or if it is a case where the address is the problem, missing the state, we provide it to our research clerk who phones the registrant to correct the error, and we also produce a microfilm listing of the contents of that error file, which is in alphabetical list for our research clerks to use as they work.

y

Once the error is corrected it is
processed through the same system and re-edited
to make sure that the corrections are done
correctly. And if it passes it goes over to the
good side of the house where we assign a
Selective Service number. And it is at this
point where you are registered with the
Selective Service and put on the master list
registrants.

we send out an acknowledgement letter to all the people who were assigned a Selective Service number and thank them for their

ნ

registration, ask them to check the information that we have on file, provides them a means to direct the information if anything is incorrect, and to notify us of any change of address in the tuture.

alphabetical list on the microfilm of all the people on our registrant files, which is once again used by the research department.

- Q. One question. If you were required to do a search under the name Hasbrouck, using the chart what files would you search and how would it be done?
- A. The first thing we do is search the alphabet listing, the microtiche listing of the master file to see if he's there. If he's not there we check on the error file to see if it is perhaps somebody who is in the process of having corrections done. We produce these microfilm listings on a monthly basis. So we also go in and check the computer files to see it anybody has come on to the computer files in the last month since we published the computer list. And we would search here and here. (pointing)
  - Q. So you would make a search of the

1	computer files and also make a search of the
2	microtiche files?
3	A. That's correct.
4	Q. Were you requested to do a search for
5	the name of Edward J. Hasprouck?
6	A. Yes, we were.
7	Q. And when was the last time a search was
8	done under that name?
y	A. The search was conducted on December
10	second of this year.
11	Q. And pursuant to your orders?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. And what were the results of the search?
14	A. The results of the search showed that
15	Edward Hasbrouck had not registered with
16	Selective Service.
17	MR. MUELLER: You can resume your
18	seat, sir.
19	I have no further questions.
20	THE COURT: Any questions? Okay.
21	You may step down.
22	MR. MUELLER: The Government's
23	next witness is Laurie Stoffel.

1	LAURIE STOFFEL, Government
2	Witness, Sworn.
3	THE WITNESS: Laurie Stoffel.
4	S-t-c-r-r-e-1.
5	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. MUELLER:
6	Q. Ms. Stoftel, you are an employee of the
7	Selective Service system?
8	A. Yes, I am.
9	Q. Where are you located?
10	A. Data Management Center at Great Lakes,
11	Illinois.
12	Q. What are your duties?
13	A. I'm a research clerk.
14	Q. And any particular type of research
15	clerk?
16	A. I research the microfiche files,
17	searching for people that have registered with
31	the Selective Service.
19	Q. Were you requested to make a search to
20	determine whether an Edward J. Hasbrouck had
21	indeed registered with the Selective Service?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. When did you conduct that search?
24	A. The last one on December second.
25	Q. What were the results of that search?

1	A. I did not find him registered.
2	Q. Did you look both under the name of
3	Edward J. Hasbrouck, as well as other names that
4	may have been, had slightly different spellings?
5	A. Yes, sir, under different spellings.
6	Q. And you tound no Edward J. Hasbrouck?
7	A. No, sir.
ъ	MR. MUELLER: No further
9	questions.
10	THE COURT: Any questions? No
11	questions. Thank you. You may step down.
12	MR. MUELLER: The Government
13	calls Richard Templer.
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
2 4	

ī	RICHARD D. TEMPLER, Government
2	witness, Sworn.
3	THE WITNESS: Richard D, Templer,
4	T - e - m - p - 1 - e - r.
5	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. MUELLER:
6	Q. Mr. Templer, you are an employee of the
7	Selective Service System?
8	A. Yes.
y	Q. Where are you located?
10	A. Great Lakes.
11	Q. Where, your responsibilities or duties
12	with Selective Service?
13	A. I'm a member of a group whose
14	responsibility it is to write and maintain the
15	series of programs that maintains the
16	registration records on our computer system.
<b>1</b> 7	Q. Do you have any training in programming?
18	A. Yes, I do.
19	Q. And could you briefly recite to us what
20	that training is?
21	A. I have been involved with data processing
22	since 1965.
23	Q. Now are part of or at least one part of
2 4	your responsibility to do checks of the computer
2 5	files to determine whether individuals have or

1	have not registered?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. Were you asked to make a check of the
4	computer files to determine whether one Edward
5	J. Hasbrouck had registered?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. When were you were you requested to do
8	that check?
9	A. December 2, 1932.
ĹŌ	Q. Did you do that check?
11	A. Yes, I did.
1 2	Q. What was the result of that check?
13	A. I did not find him in our registration
14	records.
15	Q. Did you use various spellings of the
1 5	name?
17	A. Yes.
18	MR. MUELLER: I have no further
19	questions.
20	THE COURT: Does the detense have
21	any questions? There being none, sir, you may
2 2	step down. Thank you.
23	MR. MUELLER: The Government rests.
24	THE COURT: The Government rests
25	(Pause.)

THE COURT: Okay. Does the detense wish to present any evidence? .

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Counsel, you agree?

MR. HILLER: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Now,

therefore the evidence is closed. There will be no rebuttal evidence, and therefore all the evidence, ladies and gentlemen of the jury that you will now regard has now been presented to you. We will proceed then to final statements by counsel. Do you wish to make a final statement?

lend any replies, approval or legitimacy or aignify this trial by taking any more part in it than absolutely necessary. This trial would be silly were it not that I were possibly subject to criminal penalties on the basis of it. As it is and given that it is a rather sick joke. I don't think even Mr. Mueller would pretend that the evidence he has presented to you has anything to do with the issues of registration and the draft and the purposes for which registration was reinstated, and the reasons I'm

being prosecuted, and the purposes for which a

draft was reinstated. But you are to decide on

the evidence that's presented in this Court, and

preparations for nuclear war are not in this

5 | Court and are not in evidence.

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ubviously the case will be presented to you as a jury, because there is something for you to decide. If there were no issue and no decision for you to make the case would not be presented to you. When it is presented to you you will have an absolute and unquestionable right to make that decision. And it you choose to convict or if you choose to acquit that is your absolute right, and no Court will presume to pass judgment on or overturn your decision, if you chose to make it that I am on the facts charged guilty or that I am not guilty. am not guilty and deserving of punishment. Obviously what I did had nothing to do with the I would have done exactly what I did whether it was legal or illegal, though I continue to believe, as I believed all along, that registration and the draft are unconstitutional. But the question is not whether what I did was legal, whether I

registered, whether I knew that the Government
wanted me to. And to pretend that those are the

3 issues is I think ridiculous.

MR. MUELLER: Your Honor, if I could interrupt for a second on procedure.

Generally the Government gets the opening argument and then the defense has argument and then we have rebuttal. Is the Court going to --

THE COURT: This is closing

argument.

1.8

MR. MUELLER: Okay.

on the jury is making your decision and you have a perfect right to acquit me. I hope that you will do that, I think that that will be appropriate, but I don't expect that. I realize that given what the Government has said to you and what is considered to be irrelevant, and given what the Government is probably going to tell you about the law you may not feel like you have much choice but to convict me. Although I repeat, that the issue would not go to you as a jury for a decision unless there was a real decision to to made. All you have to go on is the evidence. And I can read to you Exhibit 3

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

1 3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

for the prosecution, some parts of which Mr.

Mueller are read, because I think that all of it
is important to you and I hope you will consider
this in the jury room.

This is a letter from me Edward John Hasbrouck, 74 Elmwood Road, Wellesley, Massachusetts 02181. 3 October, 1981, on my letterhead, addressed to William French Smith Attorney General of the United States of America; James Bond, Acting Director of Selective Service; Warren Burger, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court; Ronald Reagan, President of the United States of America; George Bush, Vice-President, United States of America and President of the Senate; Thomas P O'Neill, Speaker of the House of Representatives; Edward M. Kennedy, United States Senator; Paul Tsongas, United States Senator; and Margaret Heckler Representative in Congress.

Addressed to these "Agents of the United States of America, and of the violence tor which it stands.

"According to reports in the public press -- reports which I have neither reason nor inclination to doubt -- you are now preparing

registered for the draft. I call to your attention the irrelevance of any such persecutions.

3

"Draft registration was instituted by President Jimmy Carter's proclamation of July 2nd, 1980 and continues with the collusion of President Reagan, who has let stand Carter's proclamation, the Congress, which authorized registration and funded Selective Service, and the Supreme Court which approved registration.

Massachusetts on the lith of January 1960, and with those other men of my age, whom you claim as your citizens, subjects, was supposed to register one one of the six days, 21 through the 26th of July, 1980. On the 17th of July, 1980, at a press conference in Chicago, Illinois, 1 announced my intention not to register and urged others to do likewise. I continue to publicize my non-registration, and advocate non-registration at post offices in Chicago, Boston, and Wellesley, Massachusetts, throughout July 1980 and January 1981, mass registrations. Needless to say, I did not then nor have I since

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

registered, and my statements to that effect nave been published and broadcast throughout America. I informed Brayton Harris, Assistant Director of the Selective Service of my intent not to register on the air in the studios of WBEX radio, Chicago, on the 22nd of July, 1980.

"The Selective Service, meanwhile, continues to evade the draft. Although Legislation and a presidential commission report for a draft are pending, Selective Service propaganda given to all registrants states that, quote, "there are no plans at this time for a dratt". A less obvious lie, and therefore a more intimidating one, is the Selective Service claim that non-registrants will be prosecuted. There are nearly a million non-registrants thus tar, by Selective Service esimates. But neither the federal judicial system, now at capacity, 40,000 cases per year, nor the tederal prisons, also at capacity, 25,000 people will be multiplied 20 fold, nor will they be dedicated exclusively to registration resisters. Knowing this, the Selective Service knows that only a token fraction of those wno don't register can or will ever be prosecuted.

2

3

4

5

•

8

y

1.0

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"You are now preparing for just such token prosecutions of fewer than 200 selected non-registrants. This letter is an expression of my solidarity with all those who may be prosecuted. They are not alone. I shall place myself with them, and I pleage whatever non-violent action that solidarity may may require. In prosecuting any you prosecute all. And I shall act accordingly.

"I expect to be prosecuted for writing this letter. There are numerous constitutional legal administrative and procedural defects in the registration laws, proclamation and regulations, but I will ofter no legal defenses. I do not expect rulemakers to follow their own rules. I have not registered, I have conspired not to, and I have conspired to aid and abet others not to. I owe you no apology. You are not my judges. Judgment in the end is inherently introspective. I would no more enforce my opinions on you than have you enforce yours on me. I can only hope you will judge yourselves by the test I apply to myself. Am I acting in the interest of survival? My life is being transformed by the realization that no life on

my natural lifetime. There will be revolutionary change or there will to be nuclear cmnicide.

T3

"In the spirit of survival I urge to act as I hope I would act in your place, not to use your authority for better purposes, to redirect your violence, but to renounce your authority, to begin to organize anarchically.

"This is not to say that all draft resistors are anarchists or pacifists, or communists, or atheists. Nor is it to say that I advocate anarchy, chaos, or violence. Anarchy, the absence of authority, the illegimimacy of violence is a fact, a characteristic of reality. Our lives, in accepting authority, deny their nature, and in so doing have produced a chaotic and violently suicidal world. Realism demands non-violent, non-authoritative, cooperative, and loving.

"Join me. Renounce your authority,
throw down your instruments of violence.

Convert them to creative uses if you can.

Destroy their potential for violence if you can't. Smash the doors of the jails, schools,

psychiatric prisons, and military bases, and 1 live free anarchically. 2 "Yours in Peace, With Love, and 3 For Revolution, Edward John Hasbrouck". 4 5 (Applause from the audience. ) 6 DEFENDANT: I have nothing further. 7 THE COURT: Nothing further. All 8 9 right. 1 C You may be heard. MR. MUELLER: At the outset it 11 should be clear that there is no doubt as to the 12 facts in this case. The Government proved that 1.3 Mr. Hasbrouck had a duty to register, failed to 14 register, and did so willfully and knowingly. 15 So there's really no point in spending much more 16 time over the Government's proof of the charges 17 in the indictment. 18 And, as I stated at the outset, what 19 was in issue here or exactly that is the 20 Government's proof, the Government's ability to 21 prove beyond a reasonable doubt the guilt of the 22 detendant. But it is hard to not discuss and 23 perhaps put into perspective what Mr. Hasbrouck 24

has raised. And I would like to do it and

discuss it in three parts.

2

The first one is sacrifice, the second

3

one is freedom, and the third one is duty.

4

Let's talk for a second about sacrifice.

5

What sacrifice is the Government asking

6

Mr. Hasbrouck to make? They are not asking him

7

to be inducted, they are not asking him to lay

8

his life down any place. They are asking him to

9

fill out and send in a little card, one of the

10

exhibits that you will have.

11

(Laughter from audience.).

12

MR. MUELLER: One of the exhibits 13

14

16

15

17

3 1

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that you will have in the jury room, a little card.

Now there are those, and a number of them, who have sacrificed tremendously, beginning with the War of Independence all the way up to world war II and Viet Nam. They have sacrificed far more than Mr. Hasbrouck is being asked to sacrifice. They have made major sacrifices over a period of time and they have made sacrifices just so we could have today what we have, which was a jury trial. And perhaps we ought to focus on a couple of terms that Mr.

Hasbrouck used earlier, a couple of terms such as silly, or a sick joke. Mr. Hasbrouck says that this is a silly thing, a silly operation, a silly charade, and a sick joke to bring in twelve citizens to pass on his guilt or innocence. On the other hand, the judge earlier on said this is the magic of the system. So the sacrifices over the years have been made just so we could have such a proceeding, just so the Government has to come into a courtroom such as this one and proof beyond a reasonable doubt the quilt of the defendant at the bar. Hasbrouck chooses to treat this as a charade. Mr. Hasbrouck tends to laugh at what the Government went through today. It seemed awtully quick. It seemed that the evidence took very little time to put in, but nonetheless the evidence is there.

And finally, a duty. Do we have a duty? What kind of duty is there? The Government puts on Mr. Hasbrouck and other young men the duty to till out a card and register. Is that too much to ask someone? Is that too much?.

Now the judge will instruct you that what I have said right then, what Mr. Hasbrouck

23

24

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

has said earlier, is not in issue in this case.

Mr. Hasprouck's very strong feelings about the draft are no defense to the charges here. And it is one point that one could reflect on the fact that Mr. Hasbrouck does have very strong feelings. He's allowed to have very strong feelings. There is the freedom for him to express his very strong feelings against the draft. There is, however, not the freedom to break the law that you don't particularly believe in. That indeed is in error.

 $\mathbf{10}$ 

proceeding as somewhat more than something silly, somewhat more than a sick joke. To do your duty as jurors, to evaluate the evidence, determine the guilt or innocence of Mr. Hasbrouck, and render the appropriate verdict.

Thank you for your kind attention.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ladies and gentlemen, would you rise for a moment, please. I'm about to give you instructions on the law at this present time.

And what I want at this moment in the proceedings is for you to stand for a simple purpose. And that is for you to recognize and

recall the cath that you took at the beginning of the trial. Simply, the oath asked you to render a verdict based squarely on the evidence and the law as I explain it to you and nothing more. And indeed if you do that you will be carrying out your oath, mindful that your verdict is one that we will stand by and that, of course, you must act within your conscience and within the framework of the law as best you can. So, that simple act of standing is for you to recall that and ask you now to sit down and let me explain to you the law in this particular case.

 $\perp 1$ 

I read this to you before and I resterate. The United States versus Edward J. Hasbrouck. The grand jury charges that beginning on or about July 27th, 1980 and continuing to the date of return of this indictment, which was October 6th, 1982, within the District of Massachusetts, Edward J. Hasbrouck, the defendant herein, a male person, requiring to present himself for and submit to registration pursuant to (1), the Military Selective Service Act; (2), the rules and regulations adopted pursuant to that Act;

and (3) Presidential Proclamation 4771 of July 2, 1980, did knowingly and willfully fail, evade and refuse to present himself for and submit to registration in violation of Title 50, U.S. Code appended sections 453 and 462(a). Those are the charges.

or not the Government has established those charges sufficient for you to warrant a verdict of guilty. And if so you will return a verdict of guilt. And if not you will return a verdict of not guilty.

I told you what your responsibilities were primarily just a couple of hours ago.

I'll take it that for the most part you have fully recalled them and you are prepared to abide by those rules.

I told you that your responsibilities is one to decide the facts, to put them together, taking all of your knowledge of those facts from the evidence as presented to you. I told you that you can give whatever credit you think that any of the evidence deserves. You may give it what weight you are willing to apply to the testimony and those exhibits that were issued to

you in the form of evidence. So, having in mind that, I hope that you will then decide the case upon the evidence.

Since the defendant has pleaded not guilty to the charge, has placed before you all the issues given rise to by the indictment.

That is nothing has been proved, the defendant is not guilty at this moment in time, we stand ready to hear what the results are of your findings of what the facts are, and until then the defendant enjoys the same rights and privileges that we all have, and is to be deemed not guilty until proven otherwise.

As to the charges, it is charged in this indictment — the indictment which I told you is not evidence at all, no proof, no inclination of guilt, simply a charge which remains unproved until such time as you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt as to each and every essential element of those charges. It is charged that beginning July 27th, 1980 and continuing right up to now Mr. Hasbrouck, who had the legal duty being a male person to appear for and submit to registration in accordance with the Presidential Proclamation 4771 and the

1,8

Military Selective Service Act together with its duly issued rules and regulations, did knowingly and willfully fail, evade and refuse to present nimself for and submit to the registration.

This conduct it is charged is a violation of the United States law.

so we have to go back now and attempt to describe, to define what each of those words, the essential elements of this indictment means, and whether or not there is proof sufficient to establish that there was a violation of the law and that violation was committed by the detendant himself.

charges that the offense committed was on or about a certain date. The proof need not be established with certainty the exact date of the alleged offense, it is sufficient if the evidence in the case establishes beyond a reasonable doubt that the offense was committed on a date reasonably near the date alleged. The statutes that are involved here, number one is of course Section 453 of Title 50, a number you did not remember, it is enough to know what the elements, substantially what that section of the

1 United States Code means.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

8 L

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In part it makes it the duty of every male citizen of the United States and every male person residing in the United States between the ages of 18 and 26 who has not otherwise expresslyly exempt by certain other provisions of the code to present himself for and submit to registration at the time, place, and in the manner determined by the presidential proclamation and by the rules and regulations issued under that title. President Carter, the evidence suggests, on July 2nd, 1980 in accordance with Section 453 set up the current Selective Service scheme which applies generally to male persons born on or after January 1st, This proclamation details the times and 1960. places for Selective Service registration and provides for coordination and implementation of the program by the Selective Service system.

That code, and other sections thereof, prohibits in part the knowing and willful tailure, evasion or refusal to register with the Selective Service system by a person having a legal duty to register. Let me then e plain to you having recited the law in part, what the

essential elements of the offense charged here.

There are three.

 $\mathbf{10}$ 

hasbrouck, at the time charged in the indictment had a legal duty to register with Selective Service. That's an element that you must find proved beyond a reasonable doubt it he's to be convicted.

evaded or refused to register and therefore did not perform that duty. This is another element to be proved beyond a reasonable doubt in order to establish guilt.

The third is this failure, evasion, or tailure to register was knowing and willful.

so, as stated before, the burden is always upon the prosecution to prove each of these essential elements of the law charged. The law didn't impose any requirement upon the detendant to do so, and no need, as I told you, to call any witnesses or provide any documentation or proof that one or more of these elements has not been established.

one of the essential elements is, as I have said, that at the time charged in the

register with the selective Service. It is generally the duty of every male citizen of the United States and every other person residing in the United States born after January 1st, 1960 to present himself or submit to registration at the time and place in the manner prescribed by the presidential proclamation. Under that proclamation men born after January 1st, 1950 have a duty to register. Those individuals born in the calendar year 1960 were to present themselves for registration on the date July 21 through July 26, 1980.

1.3

person and is said to have a requirement to register with Selective Service being that he was born as it is alleged after January 1st, 1960. And he is not expressly express from the registration by particular provision of the code. The defendant bears the burden of clearly establishing a right to any such exception. If defendant was born in the year 1960 then he was required to register with the Selective Service during the period beginning July 21 through July 26, 1930.

2

3

5

6

7

8

T 0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17.

1 Ց

19

21

20

22

24

25

prescribed by the Director of the Selective Service. Under regulations duly issued by the director of the Selective Service, a person required to register under the Selective Service Service.

individual required to register with the

Selective Service who was in the United States

present himself for registration before a duly

eligible males must comply with the registration

designated employee in any classified United

procedures and other rules and regulations

States post office.

at the time fixed for his registration must

required to register under the Selective Service law must: (1), complete a registration card; and (2), submit the completed card to an authorized official together with proof of his identity. The vital information supplied on the registration card is then recorded in the master computer file of the Selective Service System at which time the registration is considered complete. According to that presidential proclamation male persons eligible for Selective Service who were born in 1960 were required to

present themselves to submit to registration on

Under that presidential proclamation an

The proclamation further provides that

the dates between July 21 through July 26, 1980.

1 7

And that same Act requires that a person who continues to have the duty to register up until the time they become 26 years of age. Consequently failure to register is a continuing offense. If you find that at any time during the period covered by the indictment the defendant was under a legal obligation to register with the Selective Service, his failure to honor that obligation makes him guilty of a criminal offense if his failure was willing and willture.

knowing and wiltul, essential elements or the crime charged. There must be actual knowledge by the detendant that he had a duty to register for the Selective Service in order for the offense to be proved. You may not find the defendant guilty unless you find that beyond a reasonable doubt he knew he had a duty to register. It is not sufficient to show that the detendant may have suspected or thought that he had such a duty. The fact of knowledge, however, may be established by direct or circumstantial evidence just as any other fact may be found in this particular case.

T O

1,6

T S

serious crime, which requires proof of a specific intent before the defendant can be convicted. Specific intent as the term implies means more than general intent to commit the act. To establish specific intent the Government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant knowingly failed to do an act which the law requires, purposely intending to violate the law. Such intent may be determined from all the facts and circumstances surrounding the case.

An act or failure to act is knowingly done if done for untoward or intentionally and not because of mistake or accident or other innocent reason. Intent ordinarily may not be proved directly, because, of course, there is no way of fathoming or scutinizing the operations of the human mind. We don't read into somebody's mind, we determine it from evidence as to what other evidence as to what is going on in a person's mind. You may infer the defendant's intent from the surrounding circumstances. You may consider any statements made, act done or omitted by the defendant and all other facts and circumstances in evidence

which would indicate his state of mind. You may consider it reasonable to draw the inference to find that the -- strike that. As I said, it is entirely up to you to decide what facts to tind from the evidence.

knowingly done if done voluntarily and intentionally, and not because of mistake or accident or other innocent reason. The purpose of that adding the word "knowingly" is to ensure that no one would be convicted because of omission or failure to do an act due to mistake or accident or other innocent reason. An omission or failure to act is wiltuily done if done voluntarily and intentionally with specific intent not to do something which the law required to be cone, that is to say with bad purpose either to disobey or disregard the law.

Defendant's conduct is not wiltul if he acted through negligence, inadvertence, mistake, or due to his good faith misunderstanding of the requirements of the law. It should be pointed out, however, that disagreement with the law is not a detense. It is the duty of all citizens to obey the law whether they agree with it or

not. A person may not decide for himself

whether the law is good or bad, or feel that he

is free to disobey it. One may not disobey a

law even on the good faith that it is

unconstitutional, and on that ground avoid the

consequences of his act.

 $\mathbf{1}$  0

3 1

Now, I told you that those are the essential elements, those are really the substantive part of the charge. Those are the things that must be proved.

I have indicated to you that even to this moment, and until such time as you find otherwise, the defendant is considered innocent, that is not guilty of any crime unless it is established to you beyond a reasonable doubt that each and every essential element of the particular crime charged has been established to you. It is so that because he is presumed to be innocent that he is be to accorded all the rights and privileges, all the attention and preferences that one can have who, like you and I, are believed to stand innocent.

Now, this presumption of innocence is chly overwhelmed, only overtaken by proof beyond a reasonable doubt, proffered by coming through

the evidence presented by the Government. The burden of proving this guilt is always upon the Government and despite what may or may not have occurred during the course of this trial, that burden doesn't shift to the defendant to do anything. It simply means and always means that the Government has this responsibility of proving the elements of the defense, and for one reason or another fails to do that then you must find the defendant not guilty.

A reasonable doubt, ladies and gentlemen, is a real doubt based upon reason and commonsense after a careful and impartial consideration of all the evidence in the case.

A reasonable doubt does not mean beyond a all doubt, it means a doubt based upon good and sufficient reason.

Now, you in a moment, with one little nesitation in a moment so that I may talk to counsel and the defendant, you will be going out to deliberate. All of you will participate in the deliberations. I will choose the wisest among you to be the foreperson of the jury and you will then have certain special responsibilities. Your responsibilities as a

whole is to vote your own conscience and your own mind as to what the facts establish. The responsibility each of you individually is to establish what the evidence proves or does not prove, and then in compliance with the rules of law as I have told it to you decide whether or not the defendant has been proved guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. And it so you will vote that verdict. however, because there are twelve of you and because the rule is that it must be a unanimous verdict, if there is to be a verdict at all, it requires that you deliberate as well as you possibly can and as long as as it is necessary to see if you can have one mind in this subject. For a verdict is only a verdict if twelve of you say so. If ten of you say one thing and two of you say another thing, you do not have a verdict. And I will require you to continue to deliberate until such time as established firmly in my mind that it is impossible to come to a verdict or unlikely, or any other reason which would indicate that there is not much likelihood that you will have a verdict.

So, if you find the defendant not

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

quilty it must be by all of you. If you find the detendant quilty that too must be by all of And the way to do that, which has been done for many many years in the history of the jury system, is that jurors have worked together, strangers as they may be one to the other, not knowing each other's background and lives, and philosophies, all those things, nevertheless if you listen carefully to what others have to say, if you hear the recounting of the evidence as best one other remembers it and you put it together with your own recollection and so forth you will find that it is more likely than not that you will come to some agreement, an agreement that conforms with your own conscience of the evidence and you will be able to come to a verdict. So I ask you to work hard in doing that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

When I chose a foreperson of the jury his job will be simple. And that will be to help you to deliberate by making sure that everyone has an opportunity to speak and be heard. And from time to time if there is any question, you can decide upon that question and the foreperson can write it out and address it

manner or another, hopefully to clarify any difficulties that you may have as far as the law is. I will not be able to comment on what my version of the facts are. Indeed, I have no version of the facts, and you are to gather nothing from me as to where I stand or don't stand, or how I feel what the evidence warrants or doesn't warrant. That is for you to do that. That's your responsibility. So if you have a question you send it to me and I'll respond to it.

take a vote to see whether or not you have arrived at a unanimous verdict, and then that person will report the verdict in writing on a verdict form to be issued what that verdict is.

And I will record it and you will have spoken in the performance of your duties.

So, if you will excuse me for one second I'll be right back.

follows...

(Side bar discussion, as

THE COURT: Okay. Any objections,

admissions, additions? .

There being none. Thank you very much.

(In open court.)

THE CLERK: Juror in seat 5, Margaret Johns.

of the jury? Thank you very much.

from now on you will take that seat up tront here, and you will report from that seat after you go.

responsibilities are. I'll just remind you of one thing. You have no greater right to be heard or any greater right on a vote. It's your responsibility simply to make sure that if there are any difficulties that you can communicate those to me. Other than that, I remind each one of you that you have your own conscience to vote your own recollection of the facts to be guided by, but please pay attention to what all the others have to say and you will help in that respect.

So, you may may now retire to the

deliberation room and when you are ready you can 1 let me know. 2 3 (The jury left the courtroom at 2:43 p.m. to begin deliberations.) 5 THE COURT: Would counsel please 7 take a look at the exhibits to make sure that 8 they are in order, and only those which were 9 marked into evidence go with the jury. And then 10so certify it on the record. 11 MR. MUELLER: 1'11 certify on the 12 record that the exhibits are in order. Exhibits 13 I through 6 are the ones in evidence and should 14 15 go to the jury room. THE DEFENDANT: So far as I know. 16 (There was a recess.) 17 18 (The jury was seated - 3:00 p.m.) 19 20 (Jury verdict of Guilty on Count 1 21 returned by the jury.) 22 23 THE COURT: Any question? 24 THE DEFENDANT: 1 would request 25

that the jury be polled.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: They may be polled.

(The jury was polled and all agreed

with the verdict.)

THE COURT: Any other question? Then the verdict may be recorded.

Sit down for a few seconds, please.

I just wanted to say that though this was not a long trial by any stretch of the imagination, that it moved along without contention substantially, nevertheless I think of it as a difficult one. And I just want to express my appreciation, not for your verdict, but for your willingness to serve. I find these cases difficult. I find all cases difficult. And I find this particular case difficult pecause it raises issues that are difficult in some milieu, some settings, to adequately respond to. I look at my job as to uphold the respect and dignity or the Court and the particular system and when I cannot do that I would suspect that it would be time for me to leave. And I look to others who participate in that to do likewise, and you were a participant. whether you appreciate the draft law or you

don't appreciate the draft law, that wasn't the 1 question put to you. The question put to you 2 was was there a violation of that particular law? 3 Now that doesn't satisfy me nor I'm sure does it satisfy you, because somehow or other the real 5 issue for us is not whether or not Mr. Hasbrouck 6 failed to obey the law and who should decide 7 that issue. Well, I don't think that 8 necessarily the Court is in the position to 9 decide the issues based upon some personal 10 predilections, so neither should the jury be. 11 And it's an issue that I suppose has to be 12 decided by others, whether by vote or by those 13 in charge of the executive branch. But I 14 15 suppose unless there is something unconstitutional, which I found there not to 16 be, at least based on the issues that were 17 simply placed before me, then I think it was 18 your responsibility to listen to the evidence 19 and based only on that evidence decide the facts. 20 And if you have need to think otherwise about 21 the law, then you take that up in a different 22 forum and you are encouraged to take it up in a 2.3 different forum, pro or con, or as indeed many 24 people are, indifferent to that particular law. 25

Anyway, I don't have any speech other than to just really to say to you that I appreciate the responsibility that you had to share this afternoon. And I thought you were attentive, and I thought that you would give every fair shake to the defendant as well as to the government, that you would obey the rules. And so we can appreciate what you have done. Again, I would have respected any decision on your part except if I thought that you weren't acting with in the confines of the law.

So, with that in mind you can have the rest of the day off, and just call in tonight at tive o'clock to see if you are required tomorrow morning. And I hope you do have opportunity to sit on other juries. So at least with the Court's appreciation, you may go.

Thank you.

(The jury left the courtroom at 3:10 p.m.)

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right. I propose for a date for disposition January 12th, 1983, at nine o'clock in the morning. Is there any

difficulty about that time and date? 1 MR. MUELLER: No, your Honor. 2 THE DEFENDANT: I would prefer a 3 date later in the week, it that's possible. 4 THE COURT: I can make it later in the week. I can make it January 8th, that's 6 later in the week. Which would you prefer? . 7 THE DEFENDANT: The 12th. If you 8 9 can't THE COURT: January 14th, is that 10 later in the week. We can make it on a Saturday 11 if you want? 12 THE DEFENDANT: No, the 14th is 13 all right. January 14th is all right. 14 THE COURT: January 14th is all 15 right. 16. How about bail? Any problem with bail? 17 MR. MUELLER: No problem with 18 bail, your Honor. 19 THE COURT: All right. 20 continue this matter to nine o'clock, January 14th. 21 And you are on bail and you are subject to all 22 the conditions of bail including good behavior 23 and returning at the time and place designated 24

by the Court or at such other time and place as

we may be in future be designated.

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

⊥7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE DEFENDANT: I'll give the Court notice at this time of my intent to appeal this.

Notice is entered and THE COURT: at the time the verdict is entered the notice will be given of your right to appeal again. .

THE COURT: Let me call Mr. Hasbrouck again. And is the Government here?

well, in any event you have a responsibility to report to the probation department. That's one of the conditions of your bail. But, in any event, the requirement tor that and the need for that is to make sure that the Court is made perfectly aware of your background and circumstances and in order to assist the Court in making an appropriate sentence based upon all of the circumstances. Now if you fail to do that, I have given you notice of it, then of course you have to understand that I will be regarding what the probation department tells me what's in that

report with or without your contribution.

given, is confidential, and at least it is not available to the public, but it is information on which I rely in great measure for the imposition to be made in the case. And there is a requirement to do that. And at least failing to do so may at least waive any rights that you have in regard to what information is given to me on that probation report, with or without your assistance.

THE DEFENDANT: We can go over the outstanding personal recognizance release.

There was no condition about --

that's part of the requirement. If you don't do it I want you to know that you will be waiving your rights to contesting the probation report that I will be using in order to satisfy myself as to how to view your sentence. You have an opportunity now to provide the probation department with any information you want, any background, anything that would help to assist me and perhaps mitigate for you the disposition.

And so you will -- it is my opinion

 $\perp 0$ 

1 B

that you are wise to cooperate with that effort and to make sure that the probation department does not report to me anything or have in its report anything that may not be appropriate for me to review, or that's not correct or true. That's what the process is. And it has nothing to do with guilt or innocence or your position or political favor or anything else of the sort.

So in that respect at most it will be time spent and at best it will be something that may assist you considerably.

All right.

(Adjourned.)

	[
1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ) DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS ) ss.
2	CITY OF BOSTON )
3	
4	
5	1, Muriel F. James, Official Reporter,
6	do hereby certify that at the time and place,
7	aforesaid, I reported stenographically the
8	proceedings had in Criminal Action 82-269-01-N
9	United States of America versus Edward John
10	Hasbrouck and that the foregoing transcript is a
11	correct transcript of the proceedings taken
12	therein, to the best of my skill and ability.
13	In Witness Whereof I have hereunto set
14	my hand this 21st day of December, 1983.
15	
16	
17	S = 0
3.1	
19	Official Reporter
2 0	
21	
22	
23	
2 4	