

# U.S. government doublespeaks on violations of LaRouche's human rights

The U.S. Department of State has deceptively answered a reporter's question as to why the U.S. government has not responded to inquiries from the U.N. Human Rights Commission on the case of Lyndon LaRouche in a deliberately misleading and false manner, thereby confirming that when it comes to human rights violations, the United States practices double standards.

In a Feb. 26 release on the LaRouche case, the State Department totally ignores the issue of why the U.S. has failed to respond to human rights allegations from Special Rapporteur Angelo Vidal d'Almeida Ribeiro, in his report to the Human Rights Commission plenary session on Feb. 7, that "Mr. Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. is reported to have been subjected to harassment, investigation, and prosecution solely because of his beliefs." In the State Department briefing on Feb. 26, a reporter clearly identified that it was these allegations of the Special Rapporteur on Feb. 7 that he was referencing. Instead, the State Department changed the subject. How?

The U.N. Special Rapporteur's allegations arose as a result of a formal request by a U.N. Non-Governmental Organization—the International Progress Organization (IPO)—at the full plenary session of the 47th Session of the Human Rights Commission on Feb. 28, 1991. The State Department instead refers to other complaints on the LaRouche case which were made under a confidential procedure by the political prisoner's wife and an associate (the 1503 Procedure), which are acted on before the annual August meeting of the subcommission. This is yet another instance of the U.S. government's consistent failure to respond to the serious human rights abuses in the LaRouche case.

In the Feb. 26 release, the State Department alleges that LaRouche "and certain confederates had been found guilty of conspiracy to defraud the Internal Revenue Service." None of LaRouche's co-defendants was charged with or found guilty of anything involving the Internal Revenue Service. This official U.S. government statement is, therefore, untrue and demonstrates that they failed to check the trial record. This willful disregard of the record is not only proof of passing off false information to the United Nations, but part of a worldwide pattern of systematic inaccuracies and falsehoods spread by the State Department on the LaRouche case. In

other instances, U.S. government officials have spread lies that LaRouche was convicted for not paying his taxes (rather than the nebulous conspiracy charge) or that the amounts at issue totaled some \$30 million (when the judge established at sentencing that the total amount at issue in all charges of all defendants was under \$300,000). The State Department has willfully spread lies and falsehoods, without checking the record, as a desperate tactic to defuse the growing international outcry of human rights violations in the LaRouche case.

After the U.N. Special Rapporteur communicated allegations in writing to the U.S. government in the fall of 1991, asking for its "comments and observations" that it was in violation of the "Declaration Based on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief," in the LaRouche case, the United States has stonewalled.

## The failure to respond

Not including the Feb. 26 misleading statement, four times before the U.S. government failed to respond to the allegations: 1) It failed to answer the written communication from the Special Rapporteur; thus, the written report was printed with no rebuttal from the U.S. government (E/CN.4/1992/52). 2) When the first U.S. delegate spoke under the relevant agenda item during the plenary session in Geneva, he made no comment on the case in the Special Rapporteur's written report. 3) Vice President Dan Quayle made no mention of the allegations in his speech on Feb. 10, 1992. 4) After the delegate for the IPO challenged the United States during the plenary session on the floor of the U.N. Human Rights Commission in Geneva on Feb. 10 for gross double standards on human rights abuses by not answering on the LaRouche case, even then the U.S. government did not exercise its oral "right to reply" to his speech.

Even as the U.S. government refused in Geneva to acknowledge the existence of the Special Rapporteur's allegations, U.S. embassy personnel around the world coordinated by the same State Department were busily spreading lies about the LaRouche case. For instance, on Feb. 4, a U.S. embassy official in Bonn, Germany dispatched a signed communication on embassy stationery lying that LaRouche was not imprisoned for his political beliefs but for not paying his

taxes, a charge which LaRouche was neither convicted of, nor even indicted for. While refusing to face the human rights allegations openly in Geneva, American embassy personnel in numerous countries around the world are vigorously spreading the same falsehoods as part of a coordinated "black propaganda operation." American Embassy personnel are working for the same State Department which issued the Feb. 26 deceptive statement. Fake stories have been planted in the press from eastern Europe to Ibero-America to try to defuse the impact of the human rights violations in the LaRouche case. Various sources on Capitol Hill report that the U.S. government is surreptitiously spreading the exact same lie throughout official channels in Washington.

### **The State Department statement**

*The full text of the Feb. 26, 1992 State Department statement follows:*

U.S. Department of State/ Office of the Assistant Secretary/ Spokesman/Feb. 26, 1992.

LYNDON LAROCHE—UNHRC

**Q:** Why hasn't the United States responded to inquiries from the U.N. Human Rights Commission about possible violations of the human rights of Lyndon LaRouche? Isn't the United States applying a double standard?

**A:** Each year for the past three years, allegations have been made to the U.N. Human Rights system that the United States is violating the human rights of Lyndon LaRouche. These allegations have been made under a mechanism referred to as the confidential 1503 procedure. Under this procedure, the allegations are forwarded by the U.N. Human Rights Center to the government concerned for comment. Each year we have presented the Human Rights Center with USG [U.S. government] comments before the Sub-commission's annual meeting in August.

In each case the gist of these comments has been that Mr. LaRouche's case had been subject to due process under the American legal system. Based upon the evidence presented by the prosecution, he and certain confederates had been found guilty of conspiracy to defraud the U.S. Internal Revenue Service and is now serving his sentence.

Under the 1503 procedure, the allegations and any responses from governments can be studied at four different levels in the U.N. Human Rights system. The first three levels examine primarily whether the allegations are indicative of a consistent pattern of gross violations of human rights and merit further consideration at a higher level.

To the best of our knowledge, allegations against the United States in the LaRouche case have never even been passed up from the lowest level of examination.

We feel this indicates that the United States has been fully responsive to the U.N. inquiries and has satisfied the U.N. Human Rights system that Lyndon LaRouche's incarceration is not the result of a violation of his human rights.

---

## **LaRouche's War for Freedom**

---

# **Judge denies bail, gov't gets extra time**

by Warren A.J. Hamerman

In total contrast to the way he normally runs the "rocket docket," Judge Albert V. Bryan, Jr. ruled on March 6 that the U.S. government could have 30 days' extra time to answer Lyndon LaRouche's motion to vacate the 15-year prison sentence imposed upon him three years ago after he was framed up by the "Get LaRouche" task force. Thus, Bryan gave the government approximately double the time (60 days as compared to 34 days) which Lyndon LaRouche had from his indictment until his trial. He also demonstrated that the rocket docket is a hoax, because its adverse schedule is only being applied at the government's convenience.

Bryan also denied LaRouche's motion for bail pending the outcome of his 2255/Rule 33 Motion, on the grounds that there were "no exceptional circumstances," and that bail should be "sparingly applied."

Bryan made both of these rulings in a hearing which began with LaRouche counsel Odin Anderson reminding the judge that the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals had a panel currently sitting on his recusal because of the bias he had exhibited at LaRouche's trial and sentencing. Therefore, Anderson argued, Judge Bryan should recuse himself and should not decide on the government's request for more time and on LaRouche bail application. Bryan then denied this renewed motion to recuse himself, and proceeded to rule on the other two motions.

### **Double standards**

Bryan's action on March 6 demonstrated his gross double standards. Having denied LaRouche time to prepare a defense when liberty was at stake, now, when liberty is enthralled, the government gets all the time delay it asked for. Anderson reminded Judge Bryan: "What's good for the goose is good for the gander."

LaRouche's attorney Anderson made a clear case at the hearing that it was outrageous for the government to argue in its papers that the defense had "delayed" three years to file the motion, and therefore they should get extra time. Each day that passes is at the cost of LaRouche's liberty. Anderson stated that the process of getting the massive new evidence