

Rebut U.S. Lies in LaRouche Case at U.N.

On Feb. 17, the Vienna-based International Progress Organization (I.P.O.) presented testimony to the United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva rebutting the official reply of the U.S. government to charges of human rights violations in the case of American political prisoner Lyndon LaRouche.

In 1991, the Special Rapporteur on Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief included the LaRouche case in his report. Then, on March 24, 1992, the U.S. government sent a reply which is included in this year's report by the Special Rapporteur to the Commission.

A formal I.P.O. rebuttal to the U.S. reply, read by Ortrun Cramer, stated that the official American reply contained "numerous explicit misrepresentations of fact, distortions, and obfuscations."

First, "The U.S. government reply states that Mr. LaRouche 'has been given due process under the laws of the United States,' without making any mention of the fact that on Jan. 22, 1992, over two months before it submitted its reply, the internationally known human rights advocate and former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark and other attorneys filed before a federal court six volumes of evidence newly discovered after trial, that show LaRouche was not afforded due process. The evidence was part of a *habeas corpus* motion of more than one hundred pages, unprecedented in scope, which sought to vacate Mr. LaRouche's sentence because his conviction and detention were unlawful, based upon outrageous government misconduct."

The I.P.O. added that the massive amounts of new evidence "proved that 'the prosecution conducted and participated in a conspiracy and concerted action with others to illegally and wrongfully convict him and his associates by engaging in outrageous misconduct, including financial warfare.'



EIRNS/Debra Jambor

Ortrun Cramer

This motion is currently on appeal before the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals."

The U.S. government reply was wrong in saying that LaRouche's 1988 conviction resulted from fraudulent fundraising activities to finance his presidential campaigns: "None of the specific counts in the indictment against LaRouche or his associates involved funds to finance his presidential campaigns. Furthermore, at the sentencing hearing after trial the court found that the total value of all transactions at issue was less than \$300,000 and this money did not involve financing presidential campaigns."

The I.P.O. statement continued, "The U.S. government reply asserts

that a number of state authorities have investigated or prosecuted him and his associates for income tax crimes. There has not been a single state indictment or prosecution for income tax crimes."

While the U.S. reply asserted that a federal trial of LaRouche in Boston ended in mistrial, it failed to mention two things of great importance. First, "the day after the mistrial a member of the jury stated publicly that the jury would have voted for acquittals because they believed that it was government targetting and misconduct which had caused the situation." Also omitted was the fact that "the federal judge on the case, Robert E. Keeton, formally cited the government's 'systemic and institutional prosecutorial misconduct' in the case."

Corrupted Prosecution

Indeed, quoting again from the *habeas corpus* motion filed by Clark, the I.P.O. continued: " 'This entire prosecution, and those actions preceding and succeeding it, were so corrupted by politically motivated misconduct and bad faith as to have overwhelmed any pretext of due process and fairness in the trial. . . . Relevant and exculpatory materials were intentionally and routinely withheld by the government in an effort to preclude defenses, prevent discovery of the truth, and cover up the conspiracy and concerted action in which the government was engaged.' "

The I.P.O. rebuttal concluded, "The arrogant misrepresentations of the U.S. government in its reply to the Special Rapporteur on the LaRouche case bespeak a power which would substitute its own expediency for the principles of international law. We appeal to the Human Rights Commission to see to it that the United States government, no matter how supreme its own self-conception as the sole remaining superpower on Earth, must be held accountable to the same universal principles of international justice, human rights, and natural law as other civilized nations."