

due to governmental immunity, and that instead Stanford should use political pressure through his Congressmen, and even the White House, to “*keep the heat on Shockey*”.

**5. Greenberg Assists Stanford to Silence Journalists**

75. In what became a regular occurrence over the course of his twenty years representing Stanford, in 1991 Loumiet assisted Stanford to silence a journalist who had raised questions about Stanford Financial’s business practices. In September, 1991 Stanford sent Loumiet a copy of an article written by British journalist Tony Hetherington exposing Stanford Financial’s shady dealings in Montserrat and Antigua and reporting that Stanford Financial did not have authorization to operate banking offices in the United States. Hetherington published another article entitled “*Monster Rat in Montserrat*”, in which he described how GIBL’s advertisements offered CD rates 2-3 points higher than rates obtainable at any other financial institution and that even though GIBL was purportedly an Antiguan bank, prospective clients were directed by the advertisement to request more information from GIIS’ offices in Houston. Hetherington questioned how GIBL could be selling its bank products from the U.S. since it had no banking license there, and also hypothesized that Latin American depositors might be tricked by such advertisements into believing that, in dealing with GIBL, they were dealing with “*Texans who have been checked out by the authorities and granted a banking license*”.

76. Of course, that was Stanford’s entire business model from 1986 all the way until 2009.

77. In December 1991, Loumiet helped Stanford’s father, James Stanford, draft a threatening letter to Mr. Hetherington’s editors at the Financial Times, demanding a full public retraction or else Stanford Financial’s lawyers (i.e., Greenberg) would take “full legal recourse” against all parties involved. As a result of this letter, and apparently to avoid litigation, the