

Name: Alert ID: TMML2024033455128 A Harvard graduate and former research associate affiliated with the Kennedy School of Government and the Law School was found guilty of laundering drug money by a Luxembourg court on Thursday. Jose Franklin Jurado Rodriguez '69-70, a native of Colombia and former resident of Dunster House, was sentenced to four years and six months in prison and ordered to pay a fine of nearly \$150,000 by a panel of three judges, The Wall Street Journal reported Friday. An associate of Jurado's was sentenced to five years in prison and fined \$300,000, while a third defendant was acquitted based on insufficient evidence, the Journal reported. Jurado, who concentrated in economics while at Harvard, was convicted under a 1989 law designed to stem the flow of illegally-earned money into the country's banking system. He and his partners were charged with laundering money on behalf of several cocaine kingpins. But Jurado's lawyer, contacted by The Crimson yesterday in Brussels, said his client was not managing drug money, and that if he was, Jurado did not know it at the time. Speaking in French, the lawyer, Jean-Pierre Buyle, said that Jurado was innocent and that the trial was unfair. "It was a political judgment," Buyle said. "Luxembourg is a small country in financial distress and [the government] is scared to be entangled with drug money." Calling Jurado "an exceptional individual," Buyle said he filed an appeal immediately after the verdict was handed down. But the attorney said he does not expect the decision to be reversed, adding that he will appeal to the Strasbourg Court on Human Rights, where he said an acquittal is more likely. Friends and associates of Jurado in Cambridge expressed surprise at the verdict yesterday. Lecturer in Public Policy Mark A. R. Kleiman, who worked with Jurado for several months in the late 1980's, said his friend told him that he had fought against the growing financial influence of drug cartels while setting up a stock exchange in Colombia in the first half of the decade. Kleiman, who testified for Jurado before the Luxembourg court, said he thinks that what he saw of the prosecution's evidence was weak and that the judges were prejudiced against Jurado. "Based on the process I saw in Luxembourg, the fact that he was convicted doesn't do very much to change my belief that he's probably innocent," said Kleiman, an expert in criminal justice at the Kennedy School. "I had the strong impression that the president of the court had already made up her mind that...the defendants were guilty and regarded the presence of defense lawyers and defense witnesses as an intrusion into what should have been a simple process of convicting everybody and sending them off to prison," he added. Kleiman said he would probably testify again on Jurado's behalf if asked to do so by the defense. "If he was guilty, I'm extremely sorry to hear that my friend Franklin Jurado took the wrong road," Kleiman said. "If he's not guilty, I'm even more distressed." Adi Krause contributed to the reporting of this story. Calling Jurado "an exceptional individual," Buyle said he filed an appeal immediately after the verdict was handed down. But the attorney said he does not expect the decision to be reversed, adding that he will appeal to the Strasbourg Court on Human Rights, where he said an acquittal is more likely. Friends and associates of Jurado in Cambridge expressed surprise at the verdict yesterday. Lecturer in Public Policy Mark A. R. Kleiman, who worked with Jurado for several months in the late 1980's, said his friend told him that he had fought against the growing financial influence of drug cartels while setting up a stock exchange in Colombia in the first half of the decade. Kleiman, who testified for Jurado before the Luxembourg court, said he thinks that what he saw of the prosecution's evidence was weak and that the judges were prejudiced against Jurado. "Based on the process I saw in Luxembourg, the fact that he was convicted doesn't do very much to change my belief that he's probably innocent," said Kleiman, an expert in criminal justice at the Kennedy School. "I had the strong impression that the president of the court had already made up her mind that...the defendants were guilty and regarded the presence of defense lawyers and defense witnesses as an intrusion into what should have been a simple process of convicting everybody and sending them off to prison," he added. Kleiman said he would probably testify again on Jurado's behalf if asked to do so by the defense. "If he was guilty, I'm extremely sorry to hear that my friend Franklin Jurado took the wrong road," Kleiman said. "If he's not guilty, I'm even more distressed."