

U.N. official challenges U.S. on LaRouche human rights

For the first time, an official of the United Nations responsible for investigating human rights violations has asked that the United States respond to charges that it violated the human rights of Lyndon LaRouche, the presidential candidate who has served more than three years in a federal prison.

The U.S. government has, so far, failed to answer the charges.

The charges were made on Feb. 7 in Geneva by United Nations official Angelo Vidal d'Almeida Ribeiro, the U.N. Special Rapporteur mandated to investigate compliance with the "Declaration Based on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief." The extraordinary charges were included in a report to the 48th plenary session of the United Nations Human Rights Commission.

The Special Rapporteur's 180-page report catalogued major human rights violations from 25 nations, which, he reported to the assemblage, had been compiled from "credible and reliable information coming before him, and his work has been carried out with discretion and independence."

Vice President Dan Quayle, who appeared before the U.N. Commission on Human Rights during the morning of Feb. 10, did not comment, despite the serious nature of the charges, which include the fact that LaRouche is effectively serving a life sentence due solely to his political and philosophic beliefs.

Instead, Quayle chose to harangue the assembled delegates about human rights violations by other nations, in a speech which was widely interpreted as a threat of military actions against the less-developed countries of the South.

George Bush's vice president boasted of America's triumph in the Gulf war against Iraq, and among other things,

stated, "The days when a government charged with human rights abuses could cite 'sovereignty' or 'non-interference in internal affairs' as a defense, are gone." After giving the United States the credit for the recent liberation of central and eastern European countries from communist dictatorship—although the Bush administration was among the last to recognize most of those new governments and continues to withhold diplomatic recognition of the independent states of Croatia and Slovenia—Quayle said that nations charged with human rights abuses, should not serve as members of the U.N. Commission he was addressing.

Double standard?

The Special Rapporteur had taken up the LaRouche case following the call of the International Progress Organization (IPO) based in Vienna, delivered orally by Warren Hamerman on Feb. 28, 1991, at the 47th annual plenary session. Hamerman was the first afternoon speaker in the plenary session on Feb. 10, 1992.

He said, in part, "As of this hour, the U.S. government has remained silent on these grave allegations, a tactic of non-recognition of human rights complaints which it has loudly condemned in other nations. . . ."

"The United States has come frequently to the United Nations, including this morning the vice president, to strongly condemn smaller nations for alleged human rights violations. Lest the appearance of double standards operate when the U.S. is the accused rather than the accuser, we urge the Commission to insist upon a full and impartial investigation or Enquete into these allegations."

The United States declined to exercise its right to reply to the Hamerman speech.

Documentation

Below is the full text of the citation of the LaRouche case, in the Feb. 7 report by Special Rapporteur D'Almeida:

The Special Rapporteur was not able to establish beyond doubt, whether Mr. LaRouche's association can be considered as falling under the terms of the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief. He nevertheless felt obliged to ask the government of the United States of America to provide him with comments and observation thereon, since the allegations have been submitted to him with specific reference to the Declaration.

According to information received, United States citizen Mr. Lyndon H. LaRouche is reported to have been subjected to harassment, investigation and prosecution solely because of his beliefs. Mr. LaRouche, who is said to be founder and leader of a metaphysical association, whose beliefs are reportedly centered on the rights of all peoples to development and economic justice, was indicted 14 October 1988 and charged with "conspiracy to commit fraud," "mail fraud," and "conspiracy to defraud the Internal Revenue Service." On 27 January 1989, he was reportedly sentenced to five years imprisonment on each charge, amounting to a sentence of 15 years in prison, by the U.S. District Court of the Eastern District of Virginia, in Alexandria, Virginia. Mr. LaRouche's trial is said to have been unfair and conducted in disregard for guarantees necessary for the defense. Exclusion of evidence has also been reported in this connection as well as passing of excessive sentences for crimes which are usually said to be regarded as minor civil or administrative infractions. On 26 January 1990, Mr. LaRouche's appeal of sentence was denied by the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals which upheld the sentence of the District Court of Alexandria. It has been alleged that about 50 persons have so far been indicted because of their links with Mr. LaRouche's association, and it has been reported that they, too, have had unfair trials.

According to sources, Mr. LaRouche's beliefs have reportedly also resulted in seizure and closing down of five publishing companies whose publications have disseminated the ideas of his association. (Document E/CN.4/1992/52, p. 88, para. 74.)

Hamerman speech

What follows is the full text of Warren Hamerman's speech delivered on Feb. 10, 1992 to the 48th plenary session

of the U.N. Human Rights Commission, for the International Progress Organization:

The Government of the United States has been asked by the Special Rapporteur to provide its comments to the charges that it is persecuting a man and his association solely for their beliefs in violation of the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief.

The case is remarkable in the magnitude and nature of the human rights violation itself, despite the well-known guarantees *de jure* of freedom of expression for beliefs in the United States.

One year ago the gross human rights violations in the case of the American political prisoner Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. and his association were raised for the first time before the Human Rights Commission plenary session. It was presented again last August during the meeting of the Sub-commission in the context of an overall disturbing pattern of systematic and widespread human rights violations in the United States.

Now the Government of the United States has been asked to reply to allegations about its actions in this human rights case by the Special Rapporteur, Mr. Angelo Vidal d'Almeida Ribeiro. The Special Rapporteur, after studying the documentation in the case, some months ago asked the Government of the United States of America to provide him with "comments and observations" on the allegations that in the LaRouche case it was in violation of the Declaration.

On page 88 of his report [E/CN.4/1992/52] to this session of Human Rights Commission, the Special Rapporteur summarizes the serious situation as follows:

"According to the information received, United States citizen Mr. Lyndon H. LaRouche is reported to have been subjected to harassment, investigation and prosecution solely because of his beliefs. Mr. LaRouche, who is said to be the founder and leader of a metaphysical association whose beliefs are reportedly centered on the right of all peoples to development and economic justice, was indicted on 14 October 1988. . . . Mr. LaRouche's trial is said to have been unfair and conducted in disregard for guarantees necessary for the defense. Exclusion of evidence has also been reported in this connection as well as the passing of an excessive sentence for crimes which are usually said to be regarded as minor civil or administrative infractions. . . . It has been alleged that about 50 persons have so far been indicted because of their links with Mr. LaRouche's association and it has been reported that they, too, have had unfair trials. According to the sources, Mr. LaRouche's beliefs have reportedly also resulted in the seizure and closing down of . . . publishing companies whose publications have disseminated the ideas of the association."

As of this hour, the U.S. Government has remained silent on these grave allegations, a tactic of non-recognition of human rights complaints which it has loudly condemned in other nations.

Given the special role it has sought as a kind of chairman of its vision of a *pax universalis*, it is incumbent upon the U.S. Government to be held to the highest standards.

The United States has come frequently to the United Nations, including this morning the Vice President, to strongly condemn smaller nations for alleged human rights violations. In well-known instances the U.S. has even sought sanctions and gone to war against nations of the South in the name of righting these injustices.

Lest the appearance of double standards operate when the U.S. is the accused rather than the accuser, we urge the Commission to insist upon a full and impartial investigation or Enquete into these allegations.

From the standpoint of international law, the protection of human rights cannot be considered anymore as something that exclusively belongs to the State's internal affairs. As was rightly stated by several delegations at the 3046th meeting of the Security Council on 31 January in New York (Security Council document S/23500), a policy of double standards in regard to the application of international legal principles would undermine the validity of those very principles.

The most fundamental questions of life and liberty are at stake here. LaRouche, currently living his 70th year, has just passed the third year of his imprisonment and is serving an effective death sentence for his beliefs, with no prospect for freedom within the average human life span.

In the new strategic world since the Gulf War and collapse of the Soviet Union, the U.S. has now taken on the unchecked strategic role of defining before the United Nations its vision of justice and world order.

The International Progress Organization does not endorse the philosophic or political beliefs of Mr. LaRouche, yet we feel that the persecution of him and his followers by the government for their beliefs is a violation of fundamental human rights.

LaRouche was targeted for his political and philosophic beliefs just as others have been persecuted for their religious beliefs in cases where nations have gone outside international standards of civilized practice and law in order to suppress ideas and beliefs they viewed as threatening. Those beliefs can be briefly summarized in the following few themes.

Mr. LaRouche believes that the world is in an unprecedented crisis which threatens the existence of the entire human species. This crisis is economic, strategic, cultural, moral and spiritual in character. He believes that man has the capacity, in the living image of God, to create solutions to that crisis through using his creative powers of reason to make discoveries in science, and a new Renaissance in the classical arts, which can be translated into technological benefits, economic justice and an upgraded standard of living for all mankind, especially the poor. His beliefs strongly oppose all forms of demographic warfare against developing sector nations, debt-collection at the expense of human existence and all infringements against national sovereignty.

In these regards, his beliefs have strongly clashed with the prevailing policy commitments of the U.S. Government since the assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

It is essential that the Human Rights Commission look with even sharper eyes and act with even greater resolution given the fact that abuses are occurring in the very nation which has long been the justified world model for guarantees of free expression of beliefs, and ought to be restored to that standard again lest mankind's beacon of liberty be extinguished.

This is a test case. The concept of a New World Order is only meaningful if the basic principles of individual human rights can be enforced just as meaningfully for a citizen of a small nation as well as for a citizen from a global superpower.

Quayle 'universalis'

Excerpts follow from Dan Quayle's Feb. 10 speech to the 48th Session of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights:

For much of the 20th century, the American ideal has also found expression in foreign affairs. Simply put, we have sought universal recognition of the primacy of human rights. . . .

. . . When the world's fourth largest army invaded and terrorized the nation of Kuwait, the United Nations Security Council stood up to Iraq's aggression. . . . A month after the U.N. General Assembly redeemed its credibility by repealing, overwhelmingly, the so-called Zionism-Is-Racism resolution, we can speak of moral suasion and the growing weight of world opinion.

Unfortunately, massive human rights violations continue to occur in many parts of the world. . . . Some members of this Commission are themselves presently the subject of investigations or special procedures of the Human Rights Commission.

It is unconscionable that member states of this Commission, who are called upon to judge and set an example for others, should include those who mock the very principles we are committed to uphold. I refer in particular to the governments of Iraq, Iran, and Cuba.

This Commission should not count among its members states which are themselves gross violators of human rights. . . .

The United States will, of course, always respect the sovereignty of nations. However, you should be forewarned: We shall not hesitate to speak the truth about clear violations of civil rights and civil liberties wherever they may be found, and whoever may be responsible.

The days when a government charged with human rights abuses could cite "sovereignty" or "non-interference in internal affairs" as a defense, are gone. Today, whether we like it or not, we have all become our brothers' keeper—not merely for our brother's sake, but for our own.