

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 LAROUCHE—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

was grueling because the U.S. government had concealed evidence. The government can't now complain that LaRouche took too long to find the evidence which the government itself had deliberately concealed.

Outrageous government misconduct

Furthermore, LaRouche's motion for freedom is likely to win on the facts and law, because it is so substantive and palpable. Anderson argued that new evidence demonstrates: 1) serious and multiple violations of hiding of exculpatory evidence; 2) undisclosed rewards and inducements to key witnesses; 3) contrived and false testimony; 4) illegal abuse of the civil bankruptcy statutes; 5) the discovery of an FBI "airtel" which undermines the premises, argument, and facts which the prosecution presented at trial; and 6) the discovery that the foreman of the jury hid his connections to law enforcement and the national security apparatus.

As if to further underscore the hypocrisy of Judge Bryan's court, immediately before the LaRouche case came on the docket a multi-defendant drug and murder case involving the notorious "P. Street" gang was heard. The defense charged that the prosecution should not be allowed to change the venue of the case from Washington, D.C. to northern Virginia. Bryan used the occasion to give several pompous speeches about how serious an offense "forum shopping" is, and about how it violates the U.S. Constitution and legal standards.

When it comes to murder and drug dealing, Bryan is concerned about defendants' rights. He therefore ruled that the drug case has to go back to Washington. But it should be recalled that Bryan dismissed out of hand LaRouche's defense team when it raised the issue of the U.S. government's crude "forum shopping" in its effort to bringing LaRouche's case to Alexandria after a mistrial had been declared in his earlier Boston trial. Washington, D.C. is across the river from Alexandria, Virginia; Boston, Massachusetts is several hundred miles away from Alexandria.

Rocket docket implodes

The bail request for LaRouche's immediate release from prison came in response to U.S. government prosecutor Kent Robinson's request for a 30-day extension to answer LaRouche's motion for freedom.

The LaRouche prosecutor cited the fact that he is overworked, had prior travel commitments, and didn't want to run "the risk of creating a record in which falsehoods are left unrebutted." But back in late 1988, when LaRouche's attorneys attempted to gain time through an extension motion before the Alexandria trial, Judge Bryan himself steamed back with the following words, taken from the official transcript:

"I really don't want to hear any more about that. . . . It's reached a point where it's no longer a motion. It's a lament, and the wailing and moaning and so on has gone on as long

as I am going to hear it. You men are big men. You have tried cases before, I assume. You are experienced. I am sure you have tried cases under adversity. I will accept that this is going to be a trial under adversity for you, but I am not going to hear any more wailing and moaning and carrying on and bellyaching about why I can't be ready for trial."

Kent's lament and Al's nod

Despite this history, in his flailing written response to LaRouche's request for bail, Assistant U.S. Attorney Kent Robinson conceded that Judge Bryan has the legal authority to grant bail, but that his request for more time before the rocket docket should not be considered such exceptional circumstances. Why? He argued that with the exception of a handful of documents produced in December 1991, all of the six volumes of exhibits were available months, and in many cases years earlier, and therefore LaRouche delayed his own bid for freedom!

Always willing to serve the government, Judge Bryan has now given Prosecutor Robinson nearly double the time that LaRouche had from his indictment to his trial.

In his affidavit of bias which accompanied Attorney Anderson's request to recuse Judge Bryan from hearing LaRouche's bid for freedom, Anderson cited in part the following aspects of the judge's gross bias:

1) Judge Bryan personally made the critical decisions approving the illegal "forced bankruptcy" against LaRouche-associated firms which manufactured the alleged financial crime.

2) At sentencing, Judge Bryan couldn't suppress an outburst that the repeated suggestion by LaRouche and associates that this was a "politically inspired, politically motivated prosecution," was "errant nonsense."

3) Because of Bryan's history on the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court and his Classified Information Procedures Act rulings at trial, he can not judge the claim in LaRouche's petition that the case against him was framed up as part of an Executive Order 12333 covert intelligence operation.

Judge Bryan's outrageous rulings on March 6 only further highlight this Freemason-connected judge's gross bias in the service of U.S. government interests. Bryan, the son of the architect of the Fourth Circuit's "rocket docket," stands in the shadow of his father, a high-ranking member of the Freemasons. Bryan has a long career as protector of the interests of the Anglo-American Establishment. He was the attorney of record for Interarms, Inc., an international weapons distributor with close ties to the intelligence community networks who are documented to be at the core of Oliver North's Iran-Contra drug-for-guns operation.

It is anticipated that the LaRouche defense team will bring Judge Bryan's outrageous role in the events of March 6 to the attention of the Fourth Circuit Appeals Panel which has been convened to decide on the motion for his recusal.