

Ramsey Clark warns Europe about U.S. rights violations

by Mary Jane Freeman

Speaking before a packed audience in Copenhagen, Denmark on June 21, former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark warned that the conference on Human Rights Violations being held there by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) should carefully study the pattern of massive violations of human rights in the United States, which has gone hand-in-hand with the increased degradation of the growing ranks of the nation's poor people—many of whom are darker-skinned.

Clark's trip was sponsored by the Schiller Institute's Commission to Investigate Human Rights Violations, a non-governmental organization which is urging the CSCE to take up the case of Lyndon LaRouche, the United States economist and statesman who is now that country's most prominent political prisoner, railroaded into jail by opponents of his strategic and economic recovery policies. Also in Copenhagen urging consideration of the LaRouche case was LaRouche's wife Helga Zepp-LaRouche, who is a leading political figure in her own right in Germany.

Clark, who has long been a defender of civil rights and who authored the Voting Rights Act of 1965, went before the U.S. Supreme Court in June to ask that body to reverse LaRouche's railroad conviction. The Supreme Court refused to even consider it. At Copenhagen, Clark explained that he has no political identification with LaRouche and disagrees with many things LaRouche has said, "but I would defend to the near-death his right to say it."

U.S. prison system is intolerable

But before going into the LaRouche case, Clark spoke about many other things happening in and around the United States, "because I think it's the only context in which you

can understand what the LaRouche case is about."

"We have a prison population of a dimension that you can hardly believe in Europe," he said. "Our prison population in the United States right now exceeds the population of the city of Copenhagen. . . . Our prison population . . . is a multiple of up to 20 times, and not less than 10, of any country in Western Europe, and as far as we know, not less than 10 of any country in Eastern Europe. We have five states that have a higher prison population than the total [prison] population in South Africa. Our prisons are brutalizing places. They manufacture crime. Our prison population is the biggest growth industry in the United States—15-25% a year increase. Construction of prisons is one of the biggest businesses.

"Do you want to know who's in those prisons?" Clark continued. "Overwhelmingly, poor, young—very young, black, Hispanic, other minority men. . . . They're only slightly different from the homeless in the United States. . . . The people who live without any shelter in the United States exceed, again, the population of Copenhagen." The current estimate, he said, is about 850,000 sleeping outside on any given night.

Clark cited numerous examples of people who had been indicted and sent to prison for nothing but political reasons. Among these he included Jolla Martínez, a defector from the Salvadoran military who was on the track of CIA involvement in the murders of six priests and two women in El Salvador, and who, out of the 12 million "illegals" currently residing in the United States, was singled out for indictment for immigration violations. "None of [the illegals] have been indicted. None of them will be indicted. . . . Jolla Martínez? We'll indict him to silence his voice!"

U.S. injustice abroad

These U.S. practices extend abroad:

- “Grenada was the biggest news story by all surveys in the United States in 1983, and nobody even knows that they may hang 14 people on one day in Grenada, financed by the United States—directly by the United States. . . . The symbolism is powerful. It is: If you defy the United States in its own lake, we’ll invade and we will kill, and will indict the survivors, and they’ll be hung.”

- “What about the thousands killed in Jakarta [Indonesia] in 1965 who were simply listed by the CIA—just listed. How good was that information. What was the charge? Communism!

- “While that goes on, you see the National Endowment for Democracy. Another one of these euphemisms—it ought to be called the National Endowment for Destruction of Democracy, because it’s U.S. funding for the subversion of democratic processes in other countries by the expenditure of U.S. electoral knowledge and U.S. money to . . . install leadership in a foreign country of U.S. choice.

“How many elections in East Europe involve activity by the National Endowment for Democracy? Does that concern this conference? It ought to! It’s done the same thing in the Philippines to support Marcos when he was there; it’s done the same thing in Salvador for Duarte and Cristiani. Watch Liberia—where people have lived under a brutal military dictatorship for a decade—but the United States doesn’t express outrage when Master Sergeant Samuel K. Doe murdered Tolbert in the President’s mansion! Dragged his son out of the French embassy to kill him in the streets in front of the embassy! Took the leadership of the government down to the beach at Monrovia, tied them to stakes in the morning and let them wilt through the day before blasting their heads off that night.”

- Clark recounted his trip to Panama in January, following the U.S. invasion, and how after the U.S. military told him that only 83 Panamanians had been killed, he went out to the “Garden of Peace” cemetery and discovered a mass grave of hundreds of bodies wrapped in green bags—and that was only one of many mass graves.

- Clark noted that the “Thornburgh Doctrine” actually began in December 1986 with an Executive Order signed by President Ronald Reagan authorizing kidnappings overseas. “You ought to pay attention,” he warned the Europeans, “you could be kidnaped right from this room, under U.S. law, by U.S. agents.”

Method to the madness

Returning to what is happening on U.S. territory, Clark explained that “there’s method to this madness. Why is it that virtually every major black elected official has been the subject of a criminal investigation or a prosecution? . . . Why is [Washington, D.C. Mayor] Marion Barry on trial right now? . . . At the same time, there have been several

columns written that a principal associate of the Attorney General [Richard Thornburgh] . . . is permitted to resign and return to Pennsylvania under charges that he was using cocaine. And no investigation and no prosecution.

“Political control! You talk about American democracy, and I tell you it’s a plutocracy—without question. . . . Money absolutely dominates politics in the United States. Never doubt it. Hundreds of millions of dollars is going to our elections. That’s the way we do it. . . . Very few people in the United States have name recognition. I’m not talking about issues—you don’t know their names, much less what they stand for! There’s no discussion of the issues—it’s money, pure and simple.”

The two parties are actually one

“Then you come to someone like Lyndon LaRouche, and you see what the problem is. We have always had what we call a two-party system. It’s been called the genius of American politics. It really fools you. I’ll tell you—I’m a slow learner and I admit that—but I was 40 years old before it occurred to me that this two-party system wasn’t the greatest thing since apple pie. Then one day I realized, there’s no difference! . . .

“The two-party system is a one-party system with two names, and it’s a personality contrast. Oh, you can have a difference of opinion about flags or anything, you can have a difference of opinion about abortion—any collateral issue you can emotionalize the public on—but you find a candidate for United States Congress . . . who has favored during the last four years a significant cut, a real cut, in military expenditures, and you don’t find him. It’s a one-policy system of plutocracy. It shouldn’t be, it seems to offer choice, but it doesn’t.

“Then a Lyndon LaRouche comes along and offers an alternative in politics. Whether it’s good or bad, he is a danger to the system, just as black elected officials are. . . . You see years and years of prejudicial publicity, and then you see certain clues: He is rushed to trial. . . . If you take the biggest drug cases, 45 of the major dealers in one case, it won’t go to trial in 15 months, I guarantee you. Take Noriega, with all the fanfare. How long has he been in custody now? Since January. When does he go to trial? Maybe next January. Lyndon LaRouche—you’ve got to indict him three weeks before an election.

“I was in the Department of Justice for eight years,” Clark continued. “We never indicted a political figure before an election. . . . Because if you do, then how do the people know whether you’re using the prosecution power to manipulate the political process? And there he is, indicted, three weeks before the election! You couldn’t wait! He was on the ballot in 20 states. . . . He had a right to get as many votes as he could. He could have gotten quite a few votes—a million, 2 million, who knows. . . .”

As for the trial against LaRouche in Alexandria, Virginia,

the rigged jury selection alone was proof that “there was no intention of having a fair trial. . . . You make three sentences for five years each to impose a 15-year sentence on a man who’s 66 years old. To destroy a political movement—obviously.”

In conclusion, Clark admonished, “If you want to have change in the United States, it will have to come through the political process. . . . Unless you can wrench that free from plutocracy that absolutely controls with an iron hand that essentially one-party system, you won’t have change. And that’s what the Lyndon LaRouche case is about.”

His only crime: offending the Establishment

Mrs. Zepp-LaRouche opened her presentation by challenging the delegates to the CSCE conference that if they did not intend to become the new Congress of Vienna in which supranational power structures would be established at the expense of the “sacredness of the individual,” then they would have to seriously take up the case of her husband. “If the serious human rights violations, like the politically motivated prosecution of Lyndon LaRouche, are not taken up, then the CSCE has failed utterly. The LaRouche case is the crucial test for the CSCE.” She explained that “the only crime my husband committed, is that he offended the Anglo-American Establishment. He didn’t play by their rules.” Their rules, she was quick to add, have meant suffering and genocide, as well as the greatest threat of war throughout the world since the end of World War II.

The historical import of what choice the CSCE delegates make was detailed by Zepp-LaRouche in citing the current delicate strategic crisis unfolding inside Russia and the resulting war danger. Without the economic proposals put forward by her husband for a Just New World Economic Order, the world will most probably plunge into World War III. “This is totally unnecessary,” she pointed out, since the proposals for development and the elimination of the threat of nuclear war have been detailed by LaRouche over the last two decades. She recounted details of LaRouche’s consistent fight against genocide, for a New World Economic Order, and for the Strategic Defense Initiative.

LaRouche’s fight against genocide

Zepp-LaRouche began on this point with a strong attack of Prince Philip’s “animal rights” policy. “Everybody who knows me, is aware that I love animals—in fact I have a zoo at home,” she quipped. “But what Prince Philip and the like are proposing is too much: They spend billions of dollars for so-called ‘animal rights,’ but in reality they want to implement a policy against the rights of human beings.” She decried the policy of the Club of Rome co-founder, the late Alexander King, who wanted to eliminate the darker-skinned races because he considered them a threat to the supremacy of the white Anglo-Saxon race. On the other side, LaRouche, she pointed out, from the very beginning had fought for a

policy which would guarantee human rights to all human beings. “That my husband created a worldwide movement to defend and protect the sacredness of human life, is one of the reasons he sits in jail today.”

Already in the early 1970s, LaRouche had presented his ideas for what later became known as the New World Economic Order. In 1975 he proposed the creation of an International Development Bank; in 1978 the European Monetary System was an elaboration of the 1975 proposal; and then came his 1982 proposal for Ibero-America, called Operation Juárez. The 1982 proposal was the result of LaRouche’s discussions with Mexico’s then-President, José López Portillo. “When the Mexican President took up this proposal and implemented it in September 1982, the financial establishment went berserk. ‘If this guy from the North is accepted by the countries of the South, and they even accept and implement his proposals, then it’s time to stop him.’ And they immediately moved to crush the potential for Operation Juárez. Today, there is another opportunity to implement a similar concept with the ‘Development Triangle’ proposed by my husband from his jail cell. This would be created in Europe and then spill over into a new, just economic order.” On this aspect of LaRouche’s life’s work, the political prisoner’s wife concluded: “Had any one of these economic proposals by LaRouche been adopted, we would not face these disasters in Africa, Latin America, etc., today.

“This was probably the worst threat to the Establishment, since it was designed to prevent the superpowers from using the Third World as the playground for their genocide policies.” Mrs. LaRouche described the role of her husband in shaping the SDI policy which was formally adopted by President Ronald Reagan on March 23, 1983. “When Reagan announced this policy as official U.S. policy, shock waves went through the Establishment, at which point both they and the Soviets called for my husband’s head. Immediately thereafter, the ‘Get LaRouche’ task force was created.

“This multi-agency task force,” she explained, “including then-Vice President George Bush, knew my husband was innocent,” but they framed him up and put him in jail anyway. She asked, “What does this say about the U.S. government, about the U.S. Establishment?” It means that the U.S. government “is as corrupt as the Chinese regime.” Furthermore, she stressed that the East German secret service, the CIA, NSC, the FBI, and the KGB are no different than the Chinese secret service.

Mrs. Zepp-LaRouche assailed President Bush’s role in supporting the bloody Beijing regime, and the condominium generally, as indicative of the corruption now prevailing in the United States. She recalled the statement which LaRouche issued one year ago, immediately after the bloody massacre in Beijing, where he spoke of how a river of blood now divides people all over the world, into those who support fascism and tyranny on the one side, and freedom fighters on the other. “There is no middle ground anymore.”