

Human Rights Violations Brought Before International Tribunal

Appropriate documentary material on the gross violations of the human rights of the U.S. Labor Party now being committed by the U.S. Federal Elections Commission has been submitted by the party to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights and to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights of the Organization of American States.

Mr. Jakon Moller, Chief, Communications Unit for the UN Division of Human Rights has referred the matter to both the UN Commission on Human Rights and its Subcommittee on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities which meets this August in Geneva, Switzerland. This Subcommittee is empowered to investigate "questions of the violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms" and to strive for a friendly solution to these violations.

The submitted documentation shows that the Carter Administration, which has sanctimoniously and abrasively chastised government after government for supposed human rights violations, is at home breaking every international accord the United States has signed for the protection of individuals' freedoms.

Specifically, in persecuting the U.S. Labor Party and its individual members through the Federal Elections Commission (FEC), the Carter Administration is in violation of many aspects of the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, including Article 9 which guarantees each individual the right to freedom of opinion and expression.

The Carter Administration now also stands in violation of Articles 1 and 4 of the American Convention on Human Rights of the Organization of American States which asserts that every human being has the right to liberty and security of person and to freedom of expression and dissemination of ideas.

The FEC's actions are also in direct violation of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe signed by the United States in Helsinki in 1975.

LeRoy Jones, retired railway worker who contributed to the LaRouche Presidential campaign and who was subsequently threatened and terrorized by FEC agents, has filed suit against Unknown Agents of the Federal Elections Commission in U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. The plaintiff cites as impelling grounds for court action, Part I, Section VII of the Helsinki accords under which the U.S. agreed to:

respect human rights and fundamental freedoms including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief, for all (and) . . . promote and encourage the effective exercise of civil, political, economic, social, cultural and other rights and freedoms all of which derive from the inherent dignity of the human person and are essential for his free and full development . . .

With its attacks on the U.S. Labor Party, Liberty Lobby, Gov. Meldrim Thomson and others through the Federal Elections Commission, the Carter Administration has demonstrated that it has no concern for human rights except as a political bludgeon against governments. The international arena is, however, an important court of appeals for domestic U.S. forces mobilizing to preserve the U.S. Constitution.

Countries with representatives on the UN Subcommittee on Protection of Minorities include: France, Britain, the Soviet Union, Italy, Mexico, Rumania, Iraq, India, Egypt, Yugoslavia, and sixteen others. These countries have an important role in guaranteeing that most fundamental right — the right of peoples to organize for their economic survival and development.

Question Before Congress: Investigation Of FEC

Testimony presented by the U.S. Labor Party this week before the House Administration Committee on campaign financing laws brought to light widespread opposition to the Federal Elections Commission and deepening sentiment in favor of holding oversight hearings to review FEC activities.

Richard Cohen, U.S. Labor Party spokesman detailed for the committee how the FEC is working as an Administration plumbers unit to squash opposition, violating First Amendment rights of the Labor Party and other candidates and supporters through its illegal "investigations" of campaign financing. Cohen asked the committee to table legislation to expand FEC powers until the results of a congressional investigation into the FEC.

Despite Administration Committee Chairman Thompson's (D-N.J.) claim that the current hearings

were not the place for oversight review of the FEC, Rep. Cleveland (R-N.H.) stated that the very issue of the continued existence of the FEC is raised by the legislation under consideration.

Congress currently has before it at least 18 bills, in the lower house alone, which would extend current public financing campaign laws from presidential campaigns to congressional races, and further extend the grossly abused authority of the FEC. One committee member's aide reported that "Internecine warfare has broken out in the committee over the question of holding oversight hearings on the FEC." The Labor Party's dossier of evidence on the FEC, including FEC collusion with the Federal Bureau of Investigation to wage financial warfare against the Labor Party and Committee to Elect LaRouche, served to solidify already widespread sentiment against the FEC. That opposition ranges from

Rep. Philip Crane (R-Ill.), who called for the abolition of the FEC in the April edition of *Trial Magazine*, to Rep. Frenzl (R-Minn.) who protested the FEC's inefficient and unnecessary red-tape in a letter to the *Wall Street Journal*.

Labor Party testimony before the House panel occurred just as D.C. District Court Judge Aubrey Robinson denied the party's request for a Temporary Restraining Order against the FEC's continued in-

vestigation of the U.S. Labor Party's finances and FEC lawyers' argument for a criminal investigation against the party. When that news reached Capitol Hill, conservative Congressmen already opposed to the FEC's campaign regulations went into action. Top-ranking members of the Senate Rules and Judiciary Committees are now studying the Labor Party charges indicating that a bi-partisan coalition within the two committees may be formed to initiate an investigation.

'Does The Campaign Act Cost More Than It's Worth?'

The following are excerpts from an article, written by U.S. Representative Philip M. Crane (R-Ill.) which appeared in the April, 1977 issue of the American Trial Lawyers Association Trial Magazine. Crane calls for the replacement of the Federal Elections Campaign Act and the dismantling of the Federal Election Commission.

In 1974, Congress, in its infinite wisdom, decided to banish corruption and influence peddling from presidential politics. The instrument to accomplish this laudable goal was entitled the Federal Election Campaign Act, and was administered by the Federal Elections Commission. Two years have elapsed, a presidential election has come and gone, and there remains little evidence that the existence of the FEC has altered public life for the better. There is evidence, however, that the involvement of the federal government in regulation of elections has altered our political freedoms. It is my view that the Federal Election Campaign Act is neither necessary nor desirable, and should be replaced...

...The law requires so many reports, and prohibits so many activities that even the most scrupulous candidate runs a severe risk of falling afoul of some of its provisions. It is no accident that the two major parties spent more than \$1 million in 1976 just to deal with the provisions of the Federal Election Campaign Act. No one knows how much time was devoted to compliance by congressional and senatorial candidates.

There is general agreement that the FEC has created an administrative nightmare... The real problem with the FEC, however, is not that it is another obtuse bureaucracy. The problem is that the law FEC seeks to administer works against established political freedoms and thus threatens the entire political process.

Political contributions are a valid and defensible means of citizen participation in politics. Many people are unable to devote large amounts of time to political activity, but are in a position to make a financial contribution...

Removal of an individual's right to make a political contribution is a severe restriction upon his political freedom. The First Amendment guarantees Americans freedom of expression. One of the most tangible means of

expression is the attempt to influence his fellow citizens on the course of public policy and on the choice of candidates...

The removal of private contributions has as its purpose the elimination of the power of wealthy individuals to seek their own advancement and that of "special interest groups" to achieve their aims. In reality, it is doubtful whether this purpose has been achieved, or whether influence has simply been shifted to other interest groups. Professor Ralph K. Winter has persuasively argued that with the elimination of private contributions, real power has shifted to those political activists with free time, those who operate so-called "issue" campaigns (such as Common Cause and the environmental groups) and those who control the media. I might also place labor unions in this category. It's therefore entirely possible that all we have achieved is the substitution of one power bloc for another, while simultaneously chopping away at the First Amendment...

Incumbents Have Upper Hand

One area where private contributions are of overwhelming importance is in an election challenge to an incumbent... Barring special considerations, a successful challenger would have to raise at least twice as much as the incumbent in order to overturn the advantages of office. The \$1,000 limit on contributions has made that task virtually impossible. In a very real sense, the Federal Election Campaign Act has become the Incumbents Re-Election Act. This tendency would be even more pronounced if public financing were extended to congressional candidates.

An absurd exception to this limitation is the use of a candidate's private fortune to bankroll his campaign. The Supreme Court in *Buckley v. Valeo* removed the limitation on personal expenditures, and allowed a candidate to spend as much of his own money as he saw fit... It has been pointed out that with such provisions of law the House and Senate could be filled with nothing but millionaires.

Just as FECA has preserved incumbents, it has also preserved the dominance of the two-party system. I am personally of the belief that America works best with two parties, but I am completely opposed to the notion that this should be locked into law. Throughout our history third parties have been active and received considerable