

Captive Nations rip Reagan 'sellout'

by Oksana Polishchuk

The week beginning July 18 was proclaimed by U.S. President Reagan "Captive Nations Week." The President's alleged interest in the Captive Nations, like other Presidents before him, is only a show-piece ceremonial vote-winning gesture, aimed at placating the tens of millions of Americans of East European origin, who are concerned about the growing Soviet threat and the plight of their relatives living under captivity.

The sham nature of Reagan's concern was underlined in a letter addressed to the President by leading organizers representing a "Common Front" of six Captive Nations, now inside the U.S.S.R. Its authors express disappointment that the American leader did not raise the issue of national problems during his recent visit to the U.S.S.R. The U.S.S.R., they assert, "is anything but a union of equal peoples." It is still held together by force and its constituent "nations find themselves in a Soviet straitjacket." They pleaded that Reagan return to the United States tradition as the "Defender of National Freedom."

The "Letter to Reagan" was drafted on June 11-12, when national rights organizers of six non-Russian national movements—from the Ukraine, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Georgia, and Armenia—met in the Western Ukrainian city of Lvov (Lviv) to found a "Coordinating Committee of Patriotic Movements of the Peoples of the U.S.S.R." Thus, the Committee which has made this appeal to President Reagan represents millions and millions of voices in captivity, whose hope has been placed in Western powers to support their struggle for national sovereignty and individual freedom.

According to documents issued by the participants, now available in the West, the founding of this Committee is the most ambitious attempt yet in the post-Stalin period by the non-Russian underground fighters to forge a common front against Moscow's rule and the intense Russian chauvinism now raging throughout the Soviet empire.

The Committee's founding documents (the "Letter to Reagan" included) have been available to the Western press for weeks. For reasons of appeasement politics, and not wishing to offend Gorbachov, no Western press has yet covered the event. In one of the founding documents, the members have proposed "minimal" measures to offset continuing Russification and the rise of Russian chauvinism (e.g., the "Pamyat" Society): introduction of constitutional provisions in all the non-Russian republics making the national language

of a republic a state-language; safeguarding cultural facilities for smaller nations without their own statehood, as well as for national minorities living within the borders of other republics; repeal of clauses in the laws on education having the effect of promoting Russification; etc. A pivotal element in the activities of the "Common Front" Committee is that the leaders categorically oppose any attempt by the KGB and other forces "to preserve the status quo and divide us, setting Azerbaijanis against Armenians, Russians, and Ukrainians against Crimean Tatars, Christians against Muslims, Orthodox against Catholics, and inciting everyone against the Jews."

Documentation

'Letter to the President of the U.S.A.'

We the representatives of social organizations and national movements of the people of the U.S.S.R., have paid close attention to your actions in defense of our national rights, especially in the pre-election campaign. Your principled position [then] in respect to the Sonnenfeldt Doctrine demonstrated to us that you had deeply understood our situation and recognized the fact that by not solving the nationalities question in the U.S.S.R. there can be no democratic society, nor any hope for peace on earth. That's why your visit to the U.S.S.R. and desire to meet with us, we esteemed as yet another expression of your continued concern regarding the tense national problems, which have revealed themselves in the Baltic, Kazakhstan, Armenia, Georgia, and the Ukraine.

We hoped, Mr. President, that in your meeting with us, you would further accentuate your concern about these extremely sharp nationalities questions. We recall that the United States always came forth as a determined defender of the freedom of nations in the U.S.S.R. as [it has] with all countries of the Western World, and being true adherents of these traditions, we expected your visit to Moscow would bring a considerable change in the fate of our nations.

Unfortunately, this was not the case. In your speech the

question of freedom in the widest meaning of the word, the sovereignty of nations, and the individual was replaced by human rights in a generalized way. It was clear from your replies to correspondents that such a position did not materialize. It was clear to us that for you, the U.S.S.R. ceased being an "Empire of Evil" and the nationality problematic has become nonexistent and not even worth mentioning.

But we, Your Honored Mr. President, with all responsibility declare that there is no basis for such a reorientation. The fate of nations, inside the U.S.S.R., is foremost, and therefore the solution to these tense national problems is as well. The murder of nations [ethnocide], according to [Russia's] Imperial Design, is continuing. It expresses itself in the daily Russification, ridding national languages from governing bodies, sciences, education, culture, [in] forced migration, strengthening of economic centralization and in many other forms, worked out by imperialist deliberators for centuries. If, in the words of Lenin, the Russian Empire appeared as a "prison of nations," then such a term as the "Soviet people" today means the occupation of nations (i.e., Captive Nations) of the Soviet Union. The process of internal disintegration of national structures is continuing throughout as part of the [Soviet] social system's ways of promoting social antagonism and inter-class hatred.

The Soviet doctrine of inter-class hatred is based on anti-Christianity, rejecting the love for the neighbor, which Christianity preaches, and instead strives to create social conflicts. Now, as this philosophy of hate is suffering a full-fledged crisis, placing humanity on the brink of extinction, only Christian Agapē (Love) i.e., the essence of Christian belief, is the singular constructive force that can save the world. It protects nations from two extremities—futile (empty) Internationalism and National Chauvinism—which is the essence of Imperialism, unfolding the second under the mask of the first. This has been the characteristic practice by the Russian Empire for centuries.

Honorable Mr. President, it is difficult for us to present the fight for human rights without the fight for national sovereignty and freedom of the people. The history of mankind has taught us that only there, where there is defense of national freedom, can there be an accelerated tempo in the rights of the individual, and not the other way around.

Now, as always, the freedom of nations is one of the most important guarantees of the Rights of Man.

Honorable Mr. President, we would like to remind you that the U.S.A. should not watch with folded hands the fate of the nations which all are all found in a Soviet straitjacket. . . .

We wish you success and to successfully complete your presidency and leave behind the good name of the Defender of the Freedoms of *all* nations. June 12, 1988. (signed) Members of the Lviv Society, Representatives of the National Democratic Movement of Nations of the U.S.S.R. from Georgia, Latvia, Lithuania, Ukraine, Estonia, Armenia.

Soviet policy journal denounces LaRouche

by Luba George

On the eve of the Democratic Party Convention, the Soviet foreign ministry English-language monthly *International Affairs* attacked U.S. Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche for his intention to become President of the United States and, if not, to influence U.S. domestic and foreign policy in the next administration.

The June issue of *International Affairs* (No. 6, 1988) uses as a pretext for its latest attack, a pending decision by the Paris Supreme Court on whether to uphold a lower court's rejection of LaRouche's libel suit against Soviet publications. However, the "decision" by the Supreme Court, reported as fact by Moscow, actually will not be made until October! (This is but one of numerous inaccuracies and outright lies in the article.) Thus, Moscow's reason for coming out with a new libel against LaRouche just now, can only be understood as aimed at poisoning LaRouche's growing influence on the domestic and international scene, and a signal for LaRouche's enemies to escalate their attacks against him.

International Affairs' main concern, which emerges in the text of the attack, is LaRouche's effort to reverse the current disastrous Western appeasement of Gorbachov: "In one of the letters sent by him to *International Affairs* [which was published, with an introduction and reply by *International Affairs*, last October] he unabashedly expresses the hope that he will become U.S. President in 1989, and states that even if this does not come about, he will nonetheless exert a strong influence on the elaboration of U.S. domestic and foreign policy. He said that if this undertaking fails, Europe and the U.S.A. will perish together with him and will find themselves under Soviet rule."

The further reason for Soviet rage against LaRouche is that LaRouche has exposed those in the West who are working with Moscow to establish a global condominium, or "New Yalta," and the role of these political forces in persecuting him and his associates. This comes across explicitly in the text. LaRouche "went so far as to claim that the search allegedly conducted on his property in the U.S.A. was sanctioned, no more, no less, by the U.S. Department of Justice and . . . Moscow." The Soviets have never published such a formulation before.

Co-author: Armand Hammer

Ironically, the composition of the same issue of *International Affairs* proves the very charges which LaRouche has