



General Assembly

Distr.: General
9 March 2022

English only

Human Rights Council

Forty-ninth session

28 February–1 April 2022

Agenda item 4

Human rights situations that require the Council's attention

Written statement* submitted by Planetary Association for Clean Energy, Inc., The, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

The Secretary-General has received the following written statement which is circulated in accordance with Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31.

[7 February 2022]

* Issued as received, in the language of submission only. The views expressed in the present document do not necessarily reflect the views of the United Nations or its officials.



Another look at 1/6

On January 18, 2021, Special Rapporteurs of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) released a statement in which they condemned the “violent attempt to overturn the results of a free and fair election at the US Capitol on 6 January”, referring to the event as “shocking and incendiary”. They joined several top UN officials who had decried the “assault on democracy” immediately after the protest.

As more information on Jan. 6 comes to light, the OHCHR should consider modifying its earlier position, as it is now clear that most if not all early reports of violence by demonstrators were deliberately falsified by the United States of America security services, including the FBI. Indeed, many of these acts were apparently committed by the security services themselves.

In addition, the reference to free and fair elections in the OHCHR statement is unwarranted, since no consensus on the United States of America 2020 elections has yet emerged, either domestically or internationally among recognized election monitors.

Furthermore, the subsequent crackdown on the Jan. 6 protesters by the United States of America security services, the physical abuse of arrested protesters, and the surveillance and intimidation of their political supporters throughout the United States of America, all constitute a massive violation of UN human rights norms, as set forth in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT), and others.

Prominent the United States of America journalists, including Darren Beattie of Revolver News and Glenn Greenwald, among others, have conclusively proved that Officer Sicknick was not bludgeoned to death with a fire extinguisher, as originally reported, nor was he even attacked by protesters at all, but rather suffered two strokes and died of natural causes the day after the protest, according to the District of Columbia's chief medical examiner, forcing a retraction from The New York Times.

Julie Kelly of American Greatness analyzed all charges levelled at the Jan. 6 protestors and available footage. She unmistakably concludes that it wasn't an 'armed insurrection' as there were no arms, and it wasn't even a breach since Capitol Police officers lifted barriers and allowed protestors to enter through open doors.

Since January 6, more than 700 people have been arrested; 70 men are under pre-trial detention orders, including about 40 who are in a political prison in Washington DC specifically affected for January 6 detainees. These defendants have not been convicted of any crime, and yet have been denied bail repeatedly as their trials continue to be delayed into the middle or end of 2022, with some awaiting in jail for over a year for a trial date.

Prosecutors are petitioning the courts for indefinite incarceration, and federal judges in turn grant these punitive demands from the Department of Justice (DOJ) to incarcerate defendants for minor offences such as trespassing, parading, demonstrating, picketing - even for first time offenders. As Julie Kelly notes, “they are presumed guilty until proven innocent”. According to court memos and sentencing motions, the ‘unprecedented’ nature of the ‘attack’ on the Capitol, as well as the ‘need to deter others in cases involving domestic terrorism’, warrants this blatant disregard of the law.

Furthermore, there are detainees who have been refused medical treatment, some for injuries caused by prison guards, while certain have been placed in solitary confinement for 23 hours a day, denied access to family, lawyers, and even to evidence. This includes the 14'000 hours of Capitol Police surveillance video footage, which remains under strict protective orders to this day. Also being withheld from defendants are the transcripts of the January 6 Committee's interviews with Ray Epps, one of the ringleaders on the ground caught on numerous tapes urging and directing protestors to ‘go INTO the Capitol’, both on January 5 and January 6.

In many cases, defendants are made to read specific materials to reprogram their political beliefs, having been advised by their attorneys that political “confessions” will win them leniency.

Meanwhile, Capitol Police officer Michael Byrd faces no consequences for shooting demonstrator Ashley Babbit to death, though she carried no arms and presented no threat as video footage shows.

From a human rights' standpoint, the unjust treatment of these political prisoners is clear to any man or woman of honor claiming to support the three cornerstones of our legal system: the blind application of the law, the presumption of innocence and the right to a fair trial. The denial of their Constitutional rights of free speech, free assembly, and free and fair elections, should also appal anyone who purports to advocate for freedom, individual liberties or 'democracy'.

Several members of Congress, such as Sen. Ron Johnson, have sought answers regarding the treatment of January 6 detainees, prosecutorial overreach, scope of discovery and other abuses of powers from the DOJ, the FBI, and the January 6 Committee whose tactics the New York Times of February 6, 2022 even referred to as prosecutorial, in contrast to more common techniques reserved for congressional inquiries. The formation itself of the Committee also raises questions regarding its legitimacy, as does the extent of its purview.

House Majority Leader and January 6 Committee initiator, Nancy Pelosi, refused to heighten security on Capitol grounds on six consecutive occasions, despite being forewarned ahead of the march. Why?

On July 6, 2021, the United States of America Capitol Police announced the expansion of its powers without any oversight or congressional approval. How?

Not much clarification can be expected from these essential questions, as Attorney General Merrick Garland and FBI Director Christopher Wray, among figureheads from the Department of Defense, all join in the political ruling class' chorus of 'white supremacy' and 'domestic terrorism' constituting the greatest threat to America today, and the justification for their crackdown on citizens' rights.

January 6 is not the first event used as a pretext to inflate the surveillance state machine and weaponize the national security apparatus against the United States of America citizens. In the same manner 9/11 and the 'war on terror' was used to justify the passage of the Patriot Act in 2002, January 6 and this 'new war on terror' are being used to justify this latest expansion of the security state. Except this time they are not even bothering to formally obtain congressional approval, as noted above.

January 6 is also not the first FBI-led entrapment operation. The alleged plot to kidnap Michigan's Governor Whitmer a few months prior, was revealed to have been set up by agents and informants as well, among other similarities with January 6. Coincidentally (or not), Steven M. D'Antuono, chief of the FBI Detroit field office who oversaw the Whitmer case, was promoted by FBI Director Christopher Wray to head the Washington D.C. field office a mere few weeks before January 6.

In general, the United States of America security services have a long and well-documented history of using provocateurs to provoke violence, in order fabricate a pretext for crackdowns against dissidents.

For instance, a United States of America Army counterinsurgency handbook from 1966 recommended that the government create a "pseudo-insurgent force" to generate "incidents among the population," which could be used to "indicate to the people the need for government-sponsored population control..."

This scenario was applied in the notorious 1985 MOVE bombing, in which Philadelphia, with training, logistical support, and oversight from federal agencies FEMA and the FBI, carried out a preemptive strike against a house in North Philadelphia occupied by an armed group of black urban survivalists called MOVE. The explosives started a fire that destroyed not only the MOVE house, but two city blocks and 61 homes. All but two occupants of the MOVE house were killed, including five children.

Reports of United States of America journalists make it increasingly obvious that the so-called "insurrection" of January 6 was largely, if not entirely, a government-orchestrated provocation, whereby a peaceful protest was infiltrated by "pseudo-insurgent forces," exactly as prescribed by well-known United States of America Army counterinsurgency doctrine.

International human rights monitors, including the OHCHR, have shown a puzzling lack of interest in the obvious human rights abuses being reported.

Since the inception of the United Nations, critics in the developing world have accused the UN of being an instrument of neocolonialism, eager to point out human rights violations in developing countries, but treating human rights violations by developed Western powers with proverbial kid gloves.

In this critical moment of history, the OHCHR has a unique opportunity to demonstrate that the UN no longer fears to subject its financial patron the United States of America to the same standards of human rights that it has traditionally applied in places like Zimbabwe, the Sudan, Myanmar, or the Russian Federation.

An African regime that behaved like the Biden administration, using its state security services to suppress dissent and punish political opponents, under the guise of a “domestic war on terror,” would be swiftly condemned by the UN, and punished with sanctions.

We respectfully urge the OHCHR to reconsider its January 18, 2021 statement, in light of new evidence, and to take forceful action against the grievous human rights violations now being unleashed against political dissidents by the United States of America security services.

1) <http://www.nuremberg2.org/un/references17.pdf>