

# LaRouche advertisement unleashes a political uproar in Brazil

by Valerie Rush

The April 28 appearance in the *Washington Post* of a half-page advertisement demanding freedom for Lyndon LaRouche and bearing the signatures of 100 Ibero-American congressmen hit official Washington like the proverbial ton of bricks. Within 24 hours of the publication of the ad, the U.S. State Department ordered its mouthpieces among the Brazilian media to launch a slander-and-confusion campaign directed at the 71 Brazilian signators of the ad. At the same time, the press attaché of the U.S. embassy in Brasilia, William R. Barr, sent a May 2 letter to all 71 congressmen (see *Documentation*), repeating the slanders against LaRouche formulated by paid propagandists of the drug lobby and insulting the intelligence of the Brazilian legislators by suggesting they had somehow been tricked into defending a convicted swindler.

The statement appearing in the *Post* took the form of a petition to U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice William Rehnquist, and to Chief Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit in Virginia, Sam J. Ervin III. It reads: "The undersigned, legislators from the nations of Latin America, express the hope that the Democratic politician Lyndon H. LaRouche, known for his defense of the national sovereignty of the nations of Latin America, for his fight against drug trafficking, and in favor of the creation of a new international economic order to eliminate the International Monetary Fund's unjust policies, may immediately regain his freedom, as an expression of the justice which must characterize the government of the United States, and in observance of the principles and human rights consecrated in that nation's Constitution. We trust that North American justice, defender of human rights, will take practical steps to right the injustice of the political proceedings against LaRouche."

The 100 signers of the ad came from across the Ibero-American political spectrum.

The propaganda line issued in major Brazilian press outlets in response centered on the claim, "They didn't know what they were signing." *Jornal do Brasil*, whose majority ownership passed to Citibank in a debt-for-equity swap last year, headlined one of its articles, "It's Hard to Remember Everything Signed." The daily *Correio Brasiliense* claimed the signators were "surprised" to learn that LaRouche was "a

convicted swindler." The daily *O Globo*, leading State Department mouthpiece in Brazil and flagship publication of a media network which boasts the world's most widely viewed pornographic soap operas, suggested that the legislators were "hoodwinked."

This, not accidentally, is identical to the U.S. media response to the March 18, 1986 election victories of two LaRouche supporters in the Democratic primary in Illinois, in which the press was instructed to assert that the voters "didn't know who they were voting for." In Brazil, after being told of their alleged ignorance in this fashion, many of the congressional signers insisted to reporters that, on the contrary they had signed the petition because they knew LaRouche stood for defense of Ibero-America's sovereignty. Others were clear that they had signed with full awareness of LaRouche's legal status—in fact, that was precisely the point of the petition!

Exemplary is conservative congresswoman Sandra Cavalcanti, who told one journalist pushing the "weren't you lied to" line that she had been fully informed of the charges against LaRouche and the entire trial proceedings, and had found them sufficiently "strange" to justify her signature on the appeal for justice. Deputy Carlos Alberto Oliveira dos Santos, grilled by *Jornal do Brasil* on why he signed, responded, "My personal solidarity is due to LaRouche's position in defense of the sovereignty of the Latin American countries and, as is known, that involves the foreign debt question."

Not exactly what the State Department wanted to elicit.

In a formal response to press attaché Barr on May 4, signator Oswaldo Lima Filho, a federal deputy of the majority PMDB party and one of the most respected of Brazil's political old-timers, ignored the embassy's slanders and insisted that it is LaRouche's constitutional right "to a fair trial with due process of law" which was clearly violated by the U.S. courts, and which was the concern of the petition signers.

On April 25, just prior to the appearance of the *Post* ad, federal deputy Luiz Salomão raised for the second time the issue of justice for LaRouche before the Brazilian Chamber of Deputies. Earlier, on Feb. 28, he had reviewed the political

persecution of LaRouche, and used the image of LaRouche as “an American Dreyfus” to challenge the validity of the court findings against the U.S. economist and political leader. He had concluded his first presentation with a demand that the U.S. embassy in Brazil respond to his queries. His second address reiterated “the request I already made from this podium for the American authorities represented here, who have tried to pose as ‘sheriffs of human rights all over the world,’ to explain the shameful episode, the persecution of Mr. Lyndon LaRouche’s group. . . .”

---

## Documentation

---

*The weekly Relatorio Reservado (Confidential Report), the insider publication most carefully read by the Brazilian elite, ran the following story on page 3 of its April 24-30 issue.*

### ‘Congress: LaRouche case debated’

The chief judge of the United States Supreme Court, William Rehnquist, has in his hands a document signed by 71 Brazilian congressmen from all parties requesting the release of U.S. politician Lyndon LaRouche, sentenced to 15 years in prison in the state of Virginia on charges of tax evasion, among other things. The congressmen—64 deputies and 7 senators—are convinced LaRouche was the victim of a conspiracy to neutralize his political activity on behalf of the interests of the Ibero-American countries on the foreign debt question and against the continent’s narcotics-trafficking network. Between the lines of the short text of the petition, however, a more complicated question emerges.

The movement to free LaRouche is being promoted by the magazine which the politician founded and edited, the *Executive Intelligence Review (EIR)*, which closely followed the Iran-Contra scandal investigation and challenged the conclusions of the commission headed by Senator John Tower, later nominated by President George Bush to be United States Secretary of Defense.

According to the exposés *EIR* published in 1987, the arms sales to the Iranian regime and the Nicaraguan Contras were not isolated facts, but were part of the operations of a parallel government—covered up under the name of “Project Democracy”—and having as its keystone Lt. Col. Oliver North, one of the principal people implicated in the Iran-Contra case. According to the magazine, this group was even involved in the fall of Brazilian ex-Finance Minister Dilson Funaro. Moreover, Buster Horton, the very foreman of the jury which condemned LaRouche to a term equivalent to a life sentence (LaRouche is 66 years old), seems to be part of the group,

through his links to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)—an agency subordinated to the United States National Security Council and in charge of keeping the government apparatus functioning in the event of a grave crisis—of which Oliver North is also part.

For the magazine’s editors, the arrest and conviction of LaRouche—as well as one of his aides, sentenced, according to *EIR*, to 86 years in prison—is the way to prevent the most far-reaching implications of the Iran-Contra scandal from ending up compromising President George Bush himself, as happened to Richard Nixon in the Watergate case.

*The following are excerpts from two of a series of three articles on the LaRouche case appearing in Jornal do Brasil of April 29, one day after the appearance of the Washington Post ad.*

WASHINGTON—What do deputies José Genoíno (PT-SP) and Artur da Távola (PSDB-RJ) have in common with Pompeu de Souza (PSDB-DF) and Marcondes Gadelha (PFL-PB) and 64 other Brazilian parliamentarians—in addition, of course, to the fact that all were elected to the National Congress by direct vote? The answer appeared today in a page of the American daily *Washington Post*: all of them, and 40 other Ibero-American parliamentarians, lent their names to an immense ad which asks the American government to pardon the 15-year sentence imposed, last January, on one of the most controversial U.S. political figures of the past two decades and who, at least in the eyes of justice here, is nothing more than a thief.

His name is Lyndon LaRouche. . . .

LaRouche is systematically accused of being a fascist and of financing neo-Nazi groups in the United States—allegations which were never proven and which his followers categorically deny. “Those accusations are made by pothead journalists who smoke marijuana before writing their article,” Scanlon retorts. . . .

“He never had the right to a fair trial. The government twisted the facts and hid the truth,” charges his main spokesman, Dana Scanlon. As for the ad published yesterday, Scanlon explained that the idea was an old one. LaRouche is very well known in Latin America for his economic ideas and his absolute opposition to the International Monetary Fund, she says. “Last month, Peruvian Senator Josmell Muñoz did a tour of several parliaments in search of signatures and made the ad possible.” Muñoz had a ball in Brazil. The overwhelming majority of the signatures are from Brazilian parliamentarians, who perhaps know LaRouche’s economic theories—something which very few people know around here—but they certainly do not have the slightest idea of the polemics which go on about him.

That is certainly the only explanation for the fact that leftist deputies such as Edmilson Valentim (PC do B-RJ) or Vivaldo Barbosa (PDT-RJ) would have signed a paper asking

to free a man who constantly attacks the left and the Soviet Union, calling both the world's worst evils. . . .

### **'It is hard to remember everything signed'**

BRASILIA—The justifications of the parliamentarians who signed the statement of solidarity with Lyndon LaRouche are extremely diverse, but almost always touching on the abridgement of the right to defense and Latin American countries' sovereignty. Often, however, there are deputies and senators who do not even remember rightly what they signed and even admit they sign many things almost every day in a rather superficial manner.

Deputy Célio de Castro (PMDB-Minas Gerais), for example, says that in this case he signed the statement at the request of Amnesty International. As for the meaning of his signature, he explained it is to provide "conditions for attaining a just verdict, since his right to defense is being curtailed. We did not go into the merits of the verdict, but we are concerned that often what is legal is not just."

Among those who took a little time to recall the motive which brought him to sign the statement on behalf of the American economist was Deputy Carlos Alberto Oliveira dos Santos, or Caó [nickname] (PDT-Rio). Then, he remembered that the struggle against the foreign debt was crucial. "My personal solidarity is due to LaRouche's stand in defense of the sovereignty of the Latin American countries and, as is known, that involves the foreign debt question." Fernando Santana (PCB-Bahia) only knows that he signed on the request of colleagues. He does not even recall who presented the document, "People sign lots of things every day in the Chamber. But my name is there. I take responsibility for it."

### **'Brazilian politicians ask liberation of American rightist'**

*The following are excerpts from an April 29, 1989 article in the daily O Globo, carried on page 8.*

WASHINGTON—Brazilians in general certainly do not have the slightest idea of who Lyndon LaRouche is. But 71 of their representatives in Congress seem to know him well—unless they have been hoodwinked. These Brazilian deputies and senators signed a letter, with 29 other Latin American colleagues, published yesterday as a paid ad in the *Washington Post* asking the Chief Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States and of the Appeals Court of the State of Virginia for immediate freedom of that person—who, in Washington, could not even gain the support of a half dozen politicians. . . .

LaRouche's few most fanatic followers define him as "the third Socrates"—even though he seems to the average American like an Anglo-Saxon Reverend Moon. The publications he publishes (small-run dailies and magazines) target the Church as well as communists and homosexuals. "LaRouche's followers denounce their critics as cretins, com-

munists, traitors, or homosexuals. They think LaRouche is the only hope for the planet's survival, and that the world is crazy if it does not accept it as such," wrote political commentator John Mintz in the *Washington Post* recently.

Despite this fame, no fewer than 71 Brazilian parliamentarians testified to Lyndon LaRouche's good character in a letter published yesterday under the auspices of the Commission for the Investigation of Human Rights Violations—an entity created by LaRouche himself. Among them are well-known figures of the Brazilian political panorama like Adhemar de Barros, Rita and Gerson Camata, Carlos Alberto Caó, Sandra Cavalcanti, Artur da Távola, Aécio Neves, and Beth Mendes. The list also includes PTers like Jose Genoíno and Irma Passoni. . . .

### **U.S. Information Service intervenes**

*The Brasilia office of the U.S. Information Service (USIS) sent every signer of the Washington Post advertisement a packet, including a cover letter, a copy of their letter to Deputy Luiz Salomão, and a copy of the ad. The letters are dated May 2 and are on "USIS, Brasilia," letterhead, signed by U.S. press attaché William R. Barr. They read as follows:*

Dear Mr. Congressman,

On April 25, Deputy Luiz Salomão invited the United States Embassy to provide clarification on his accusations to the effect that Mr. Lyndon LaRouche had been tried and convicted for political reasons.

For your information, we are attaching a copy of the letter we sent to the illustrious parliamentarian with the requested clarifications and which indicates that Mr. LaRouche was convicted on 13 counts of mail fraud, illegal loan solicitation, and violations of the U.S. tax code.

We believe it opportune to add, furthermore, that an organization entitled "Commission to Investigate Human Rights Violations," headquartered in Leesburg, Virginia, where the LaRouche Organization has its headquarters, published a paid advertisement in *The Washington Post*, April 28 on the matter. The advertisement included the name of Your Excellency among the many which, supposedly, signed the petition asking for Mr. LaRouche's freedom. We also include a clipping of the ad.

*The letter to Salomão reads:*

Esteemed Deputy:

On April 25, Your Excellency made a speech in the Chamber's short working session criticizing the legal process conducted in United States courts which resulted in the conviction of Lyndon LaRouche for violating U.S. laws. Concluding, Your Excellency invited the American Embassy to "provide clarification on this question."

Your Excellency alleges that Mr. LaRouche was tried for his political ideas. That is not true.

Mr. LaRouche was convicted in December 1988, on 13 counts of mail fraud and illegal loan solicitation. He was also convicted of damages to the U.S. Internal Revenue Service. Mr. LaRouche has not filed income tax returns since 1979.

In January 1989 he was sentenced to 15 years in prison. (Mr. LaRouche could have received a sentence of up to 65 years for the crimes for which he was convicted.)

The victims of the mail fraud and illegal loan solicitation imputed to him were citizens who loaned money to the LaRouche Group. Many of them were elderly retired people who lost thousands of dollars in loans that were never repaid and which, according to testimony, the LaRouche Group had no intention of paying.

Mr. LaRouche was not tried for his political convictions which, as unpopular as they may be, are constitutionally protected, a protection extended even to Mr. LaRouche's allegation that Queen Elizabeth II heads a narcotics trafficking network.

As for the inclusion in your speech of references to Capt. Alfred Dreyfus, any suggestion of parallel with Mr. LaRouche is absurd. Dreyfus was the victim of prejudice based on anti-Semitism; the Anti-Defamation League accuses Mr. LaRouche's organization of being overtly anti-Semitic.

*Deputy Oswaldo Lima Filho replied to Barr in a May 4 letter on Chamber of Deputies stationery. The text reads:*

Thank you, sir, for sending the May 2, 1989 letter, accompanied by documents sent to Mr. Deputy Luiz Salomão, about the request for reversing the trials conducted by the Courts of the State of Virginia, U.S.A., against citizen Lyndon LaRouche.

An examination of the publications sent me by *Resumen Ejecutivo* magazine about the trials in question demonstrate that the accused was absolved of identical accusations by verdict of the Criminal Court of Boston, and that the trial before the Court of Alexandria, Va., was too short, with the accused being denied some of his constitutional rights.

The appeal signed by one of the great jurists of the United States of America, attorney Ramsey Clark, former U.S. Attorney General, demonstrates the violation of these rights in the cited trial.

Neither I nor the signators of the referenced appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court question the issue of merit involved in the trial, but rather its procedural defects, defects which violate the Constitution of the United States.

Whatever Mr. Lyndon LaRouche's political or religious convictions may be, he is "entitled to a fair trial with due process of law" [in English in the original].

That is what is expected by this long-time admirer of the U.S. Supreme Court, of whom Justice Marshall is a permanent adornment and example.

## Greens grab Ecuador's jungle, target Brazil

by Mark Sonnenblick

On April 5, Ecuador submitted to one of the largest land-grabs in history. Its central bank agreed to honor at face value \$9 million in foreign debt which "environmentalist" groups had bought for \$1 million. What's more, it will pay 60% annual interest to the groups' local front, the Nature Foundation (*Fundación Natura*), in local currency.

John Shores of the Nature Conservancy lobbying group in Washington boasted, "The bonds will have an interest rate of 60%, so even if the economy doesn't improve, we will get 10 or 20 times our investment, while lowering Ecuador's debt."

Ecuador's debt, upon which it has not paid a penny since January 1987, now stands at \$10 billion. So, it has been cut by \$9 million, less than a thousandth part. American Express Bank, Morgan Guaranty Trust, and Bankers Trust were able to unload for \$1 million, debts which were otherwise totally worthless. The \$10-20 million that bankrupt Ecuador will have to pay out to the Nature Foundation over the next eight years cannot help but add to the country's inflationary blow-out.

The Nature Foundation will spend the money running a national park system to make preservation of plants and animals the nation's priority, instead of improving the lot of impoverished human beings. Foundation president Roque Sevilla boasted in a paper he wrote for the United Nations Environment Program, "Ecuador now has 14 protected Natural Areas which encompass more than 11% of the national territory."

### 'Our Amazon for development'

Ecuador, Bolivia, Costa Rica, and the Philippines have succumbed to such "debt-for-nature" schemes. But, nationalist forces in Brazil and Peru have blocked the malthusians from violating their territorial sovereignty.

"The Amazon region is 7 million square kilometers with resources and plains which should serve Latin America," Peruvian President Alan García asserted April 17. He spoke at the founding session of the Amazon Parliament, which was formed by Brazil, Peru, Ecuador, Venezuela, Colombia, Bolivia, Guyana, and Suriname. The Amazon Parliament "will be the instrument for integration to solve common problems," declared its first chairman, Peruvian Deputy Hector