

LaRouche human rights case is featured in Moscow newspaper

The Moscow daily Nezavisimaya Gazeta, whose circulation is nearly 200,000, carried a feature article about Lyndon LaRouche on Oct. 1, titled "The True and Complete Story of a Human Rights Campaign." The article was written by Sergei Mitrofanov, before the imposition of press censorship and the attack on the Russian Parliament. We publish excerpts here.

. . . At the beginning of August my good friend Viktor Kuzin (deputy chairman of the Committee on Legality of the Moscow City Council, which is practically an illegal organization by now), went to the United States on the invitation of an organization of radicals there, the so-called Schiller Institute. He came back terribly agitated: "America is not at all what we imagine. There are also dissidents there, and we should help them right away."

At his press conference, which was attended by two and a half journalists, Kuzin told about a certain Lyndon LaRouche, "a prominent American economist and political figure," who is currently serving a 15-year prison term. In Kuzin's words, the institute, founded by LaRouche in 1984, sees the model for progress differently than do the communists and the party of democrats in Russia (which means also differently than Kuzin), and differently than the International Monetary Fund. According to Schiller Institute data, the policy of the IMF, as a rule, leads to the collapse of national statehood and the ruin of the social organism. This position, according to LaRouche's lawyers, led to the organization of pressure on the institute by both the KGB (because of LaRouche's promotion of the Strategic Defense Initiative doctrine in the late 1970s) and the CIA (because of his appeal to developing countries, not to pay their debts to the IMF).

As a result of the combined pressure of these special services, Lyndon LaRouche, "several-time candidate for the U.S. presidency," was sentenced to 15 years of imprisonment, formally on charges of financial malfeasance and tax evasion. Besides LaRouche, other representatives of the Schiller Institute were condemned to various prison terms. Michael Billington got a 77-year sentence, Rochelle Ascher got 10 years. In October of this year, Donald Phau is to go to prison for 25 years, and Anita and Paul Gallagher for 39 and 34 years, respectively. . . .

We acted from purely journalistic considerations. First

of all, material on a dissident in the U.S., whoever he might be, and about intrigues of the secret services and a worldwide plot, is highly scandalous, and therefore guaranteed to be readable. Consequently, this material is worthy of being written about. Secondly, although we have no bias with respect to the activity of the IMF in Russia, we also have no certainty, that all of its activity is for the good. Who doubts, that huge credits will have to be given to us somehow? And who is ignorant of the "special circumstances" of Russia, which make it possible to suppose that the greater part of them will land in the pockets of people who are not exactly patriots? We thought that to present the opinion of some opponents of the activity of the IMF, and thereby to prompt discussion about whether those credits are necessary or not, as well as about the purposes for which they would be used, and monitoring of this, would be not only not harmful, but even useful. And finally, judicial errors are also possible in the U.S., which means that it is necessary to react to alarm signals from there.

Preparing for this article, we met with Schiller Institute coordinator Karl-Michael Vitt, who was in Moscow—a big man, with a nice open face. Here is a short history of the problem, as laid out by Mr. Vitt.

From the moment it was founded, the Schiller Institute pursued the goal of "establishing a new, just economic order in the world." Not overestimating their capabilities, the Schiller people wanted to counterpose an ethical approach, to the global political and economic negative, as well as to the influence of international oligarchies. The scope of its intervention in public life is rather broad: from "a revolution in the construction of musical instruments" to policies against the IMF. Thus, in 1988 the Schiller Institute undertook to attempt to introduce a bill in the Italian Parliament, that would mandate a lowering of the construction of musical instruments, because performing arias in the modern interpretation is destroying many unique voices. Then, just a little bit later, Lyndon LaRouche appealed to the developing countries to refuse to pay their debts. In his opinion, these debts are impossible to pay anyway, while the debt burden restrains the development of the debtors and creates an illusion of stability on the part of the creditors. It was this latter demand by the Schiller people, together with the fact that LaRouche ran for President of the U.S., that Karl-Michael Vitt believes was the reason for the pressure organized by the international banks.

In Mr. Vitt's words, as outsiders in politics and solitary rebel intellectuals, the Schiller people nevertheless threaten to upset the world balance. . . .

Attempting to formulate our own (independent) view of the activity of this numerically small group of radicals in the West, we even read Lyndon LaRouche's textbook, *So, You Wish to Learn All About Economics?* published by the Ukrainian University in Moscow. We got the impression that in the descriptive section, the Schiller people are right on a lot

of things, and that their point of view is not brand new. . . . In any case, it seemed to us that the Schiller people are people of their convictions, and that the sentences they received from the American justice system are so incommensurate with the indictments (in this country, you'd have to at least dismember somebody, to get such a sentence), that these sentences really do smell of something very familiar. . . .

We wrote an article in which we presented all the arguments "for" and "against" LaRouche's theory, without embellishing its fantastical character whatsoever. And we took it to a certain democratic newspaper. Well, the article was rejected. It's worth focusing in on the arguments, because they highlight a quite special problem that has nothing to do with LaRouche but is connected to that social ailment which I mentioned above. Here are the arguments:

1) In America, they don't just put people in prison.

(Well, fine. That says it all. After getting such an argument, all you can do is to leave on tiptoes, pressing your hat to your chest. How good it is, that there are still Americans who have doubts about this! What if we had been answered like that in the 1970s or 1980s!)

2) We have a liberal newspaper. A neutral attitude to socialists is unacceptable.

(What a refined understanding of liberalism!)

3) This LaRouche of yours in the U.S. is just like our Zhirinovskiy. LaRouche is an American Kurginyan.

(May be, may be. . . . I am sorry. [English in original.] But Zhirinovskiy and Kurginyan are still at large, and feeling fine, aren't they?)

4) LaRouche's theories are similar to the views of Oleg Lobov, and any Lobovshchina is unacceptable to us, because, once again, we have a liberal newspaper.

(Well, LaRouche really has a bad luck!)

5) LaRouche is a crook. We know this very well. He refused to pay taxes, and that is a serious crime.

. . . Suddenly we felt that they were beginning to look at us as if we were some kind of communists, and they were already grabbing their mausers. Dear gentlemen, we did not want anything like this! God knows, we have no doubt, that we have a punitive system here, but over there it's fair and, what's the word?—civilized. We don't even doubt "the LaRouchies" evade taxes, in their spare time when they're not writing articles (well, maybe we doubted it just a little bit), and are thereby harming friendly America. But please excuse us for looking at things from our own belltower. You realize, that if we were to judge so strictly, then absolutely the entire government would have to be jailed, all the officials, and at least three-quarters of the population; and, as everybody knows, justice should be meted out equally spread all over the world. And then . . . 15 years for a 70-year old essay-writer is just not right, no matter what kind of a Kurginyan or Zhirinovskiy he might be. Don't you sense that? Going by the American movies, they deal more liberally with rapists and maniacs there. . . .

Economic deals bring India and Iran closer

by Ramtanu Maitra and Susan B. Maitra

Indian Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao's recent visit to Iran on Sept. 20-23, following his successful tension-easing trip to China, has brought into focus the possibility of a new strategic alliance in Asia. On Delhi's part, the search for new friends in Asia and efforts to reestablish old ties distorted by the vicious Cold War power game are as much attempts to play the role of a stabilizer in Asia as they are to find new economic partners in the region.

Rao's trip to Teheran was built up at the outset as a venture to further economic cooperation between the two nations. To that extent, the trip was highly successful. Besides the warm reception that the Indian prime minister was given, Iran signed two memoranda of understanding with India for cooperation on surface transport and transit facilities, science, and technology. Implementation of the memorandum of understanding, including laying a gas pipeline, setting up a chemical fertilizer plant, and technical cooperation in the field of oil and gas, are to be strengthened by giving a substantial filip to economic and trade ties.

The agreement represents a reversal of the noticeable hesitancy over recent years to move forward on economic cooperation. In the pre-Islamic Revolution days, the Shah of Iran was favorably inclined to increase trade ties, and India was a major trading partner in the early 1970s, although New Delhi kept its distance from Iran politically in light of the Shah's military and economic ties with Washington and Teheran's anti-Soviet postures. Since then, however, economic and political relations have seen a steady decline, and Iran's vocal support of the Kashmiri militants did little to assuage India's apprehensions.

Hectic diplomatic efforts in the post-Cold War days by the present Indian government, with a clear show of interest from President Ali Akbar Rafsanjani and Prime Minister Rao's old friend, Foreign Minister Ali Akbar Velayati, set the stage for the recent visit.

New strategic alliance

Only two days before Rao's scheduled departure for Iran, President Rafsanjani, in an interview with the pro-government English-language daily, the *Hindustan Times*, stated that Iran seeks better economic and political relations with