

Soviets' Fatal Reaction To LaRouche and Reagan

by Rachel Douglas

The following is adapted from the address of EIR Eastern Europe editor Rachel Douglas—"The Andropov/Gorbachev Regime's Attacks on LaRouche"—to the March 21-22, 1993 ICLC/Schiller Institute conference. The presentation made extensive use of slides and other illustrations. This text first appeared in an EIR White Paper shortly thereafter.

In the 1950s, when Nikita Khrushchov was general secretary of the Communist Party, Soviet leaders publicly signed on to the doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction. Soviet officials were at meetings where MAD was developed: the Pugwash conferences of 1957 and 1958; and Dartmouth Conference seminars with members of the Anglo-American Establishment in the United States. Khrushchov himself corresponded with Bertrand Russell, a key architect of MAD, on the unthinkability of war in the nuclear age. But this did not change the strategy of the Soviet High Command.

In 1962, Marshal V.D. Sokolovsky published his book, *Military Strategy*. He expressed Soviet strategic thinking as follows: "An anti-missile defense system for the country should obviously consist of the following: long-range detection of missiles using powerful radar or other . . . equipment to assure detection of missiles during the boost phase; . . . timely warning, and application of active measures; . . . devices to assure deflection of the missile from its . . . target and, possibly, to blow it up along its trajectory.

"Possibilities are being studied for the use, against rockets, of a stream of high-speed neutrons as small detonators for the nuclear charge of the rocket. . . . Special attention is devoted to lasers; it is considered that in the future, any missile and satellite can be destroyed with powerful lasers."

It was only in the late 1960s—after the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962, after the assassination of President Kennedy in 1963, when the Vietnam War was well under way, when a period of destabilizations in Western Europe had begun that ended the career of the great statesman Gen. Charles de Gaulle—it was only then, that Moscow moved to enshrine MAD in treaty documents with the United States. Their negotiating partner was Robert Strange McNamara, Secretary of Defense under President Lyndon Johnson. People over 40 will remember McNamara for his Vietnam "body-counts." At the close of 1967, he launched negotiations for a treaty to ban anti-ballistic missile systems—the ABM Treaty.

As late as January 1968, after McNamara's first ABM

Treaty overture to Moscow, Soviet Prime Minister Kosygin said at a press conference in London, that any power that was capable of developing technical means to destroy nuclear-tipped missiles, and did *not* do so—did *not* develop such strategic defense—was clearly advocating offensive nuclear war! Two months later, Moscow signalled a shift in public posture. The shift was announced by means of a long article in *Pravda*, which made the classic MAD argument, that general war would be unthinkable in the nuclear age. The author was a former advisor to Khrushchov and to Yuri Andropov at Communist Party Central Committee, before Andropov took charge of the KGB in 1967. His name was Fyodor Burlatsky.

After Johnson and McNamara left office in 1968, negotiations for the ABM Treaty were completed by Henry Kissinger. President Nixon and General Secretary Brezhnev signed the ABM Treaty in 1972. It limited each side to one ABM defense system. The United States maintained defenses for missile fields in North Dakota. The Soviets installed the Galosh ABM system around the capital city, Moscow.

What Moscow Knew

In the 1970s—for example, in a 1976 campaign pamphlet titled "The Danger of General War"—Lyndon LaRouche was warning that the adoption of MAD increased the danger of general war. Moscow was well aware of what LaRouche was saying and publishing in those years. Judging by how Soviet so-called journalists would pop up at *Executive Intelligence Review* headquarters to collect LaRouche pamphlets or copies of *EIR*, the KGB was watching LaRouche closely.

Fusion Energy Foundation publications often wrote on Soviet laser fusion work. Moscow knew, that we knew, the military applications of these technologies. FEF representatives attended conferences in Russia in the 1970s.

In fact, anybody who chose to look at the evidence could see that as soon as the ink was dry on the ABM Treaty, Soviet Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) programs were just taken behind closed doors. A pamphlet published in the Soviet Union in 1974, two years after the ABM Treaty, slipped past the censors even though it included a diagram of an anti-missile defense system, with the label "light beam to burn hole in missile."

The Soviets knew of LaRouche's access to President Ronald Reagan. Half a dozen Soviet representatives, including Mr. Shershnev of the back-channel, were present at the February 1982 *EIR* seminar in Washington, where LaRouche proposed joint development of BMD by the United States and the Soviet Union.

Andropov's Fury

When Reagan spoke on March 23, 1983, the Soviets knew that it was LaRouche's policy the President had enunciated, against all the assurances of Moscow's friends in the U.S. Democratic Party and Kissinger's circles. An East German magazine on nuclear energy later acknowledged LaRouche as



The Soviet press empire mobilized against LaRouche in the mid-1980s, in the wake of Ronald Reagan's launching of an SDI policy they knew to be LaRouche's. KGB "journalist" Fyodor Burlatsky, shown, wrote several of the major attacks.

"the direct forerunner of the doctrine pronounced by Reagan."

The general secretary of the Communist Party, Yuri Andropov, was quick to respond, and he was furious. On March 27, 1983, *Pravda* printed a front-page interview with Andropov. Question: "President Reagan declared that he had devised a new, defensive conception. What does this amount to in practice?" Andropov: "This requires special mention. . . . Laymen may find it even attractive, as the President speaks about what seem to be defensive measures. But . . . the strategic offensive forces of the United States will continue to be developed and upgraded . . . to acquire a nuclear first-strike capability. Under these conditions, the intention to secure . . . ABM defenses . . . is a bid to disarm the Soviet Union in the face of the U.S. nuclear threat."

It is instructive to hear how Andropov's response was characterized by a third party. Soviet emigré Ilya Zemtsov, head of a think-tank in Israel, wrote in his book on Andropov: "Only once did Andropov's nerves fail him. It happened when the American President announced a new nuclear strategy based on the development of laser weaponry. Andropov answered Reagan calmly, as always, but notes of panic could be clearly detected. . . . He called the American President's actions and policies 'deceitful,' 'irresponsible,' 'crazy,' and 'mad.' . . . It was on this occasion that the world could see the true Andropov."

On April 24, 1983, Andropov came out with an interview

in West Germany's *Der Spiegel* magazine. Andropov rejected the SDI policy as fraught with "adventurism and danger." He said it would "bring the world closer to the nuclear precipice," and accused Reagan of "planting a mine under the entire process of strategic arms limitation." Instead of SDI, Andropov in this interview suggested, in bald geopolitical language, that the United States and the Soviet Union should divide the world into spheres of influence.

In a press release on July 7, 1983, LaRouche issued what he called "an open challenge to the morality of Soviet General Secretary Yuri Andropov." Speaking "solely as a private citizen and public political figure of the United States," LaRouche noted that while Andropov attacked Reagan's speech, he had kept its content from the Soviet population. The Soviet press never published the text of Reagan's March 23 offer. LaRouche concluded: "Act to stop this nonsense now. Let the world know that you are sensible enough to accept the generous offer President Reagan extended on March 23, 1983. Prove that you are truly a man of peace."

There was no such proof forthcoming from Andropov. Instead, on Aug. 10, 1983, a full-page article by Fyodor Burlatsky appeared in the weekly *Literaturnaya Gazeta*. Burlatsky attacked the SDI in violent terms: "If . . . the Americans could be the first to create a somewhat effective space defense system . . . then this would create a practically irresistible temptation for the American military men and politicians: To inflict a first strike and forever get rid of the adversary. On the other hand, the Soviet Union and its allies would be faced with a totally new military and political dilemma. In other words, space weapons are provocative weapons; they are, absolutely, a *casus belli* for nuclear war."

Casus belli means an event that is "the occasion for war"—for example, the bombing of Pearl Harbor on Dec. 7, 1941, or the assassination of the Archduke Ferdinand in Sarajevo on July 28, 1914.

On Oct. 26, 1983, Burlatsky followed up with another article in *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, headlined "Star Wars." This time, he attacked LaRouche by name. He quoted a leaflet issued by the European Labor Party, called "Beam Weapons: Soviets Threaten Nuclear Strike." Burlatsky quoted it: "Instead of accepting Reagan's proposal for joint development of beam weapons, which the Soviet Union is secretly developing anyway, Burlatsky threatens a Russian preventive strike." Then Burlatsky wrote, "Reading these lines, I did not know if I should be indignant, or laugh, about the amusing and ridiculous maxims of the authors, the conjugal symbiosis of the American LaRouche and his wife, the German Helga Zepp-LaRouche, who come out in the name of . . . a non-existent party."

A Wedge in NATO

It was apparent, that Soviet strategists would try to use the SDI as a wedge to break the NATO alliance, pushing a propaganda line that Washington wanted to hide behind an anti-missile defense screen, leaving Western Europe to its

own devices. This was when Kissinger and others were talking about “decoupling” Europe from North America. In pamphlets like “The Risk of Nuclear War in Europe” (1983), LaRouche motivated the importance of SDI for Europe’s security. In the fall of 1983 and in early 1984, LaRouche spoke to military men, politicians, and economists at *EIR* seminars in several European countries, on the general benefits of SDI. It was in 1984 that Helga Zepp-LaRouche founded the Schiller Institute, as an emergency initiative to save the Western alliance, through a true renaissance of culture and statecraft.

On Nov. 15, 1983, the Soviet state newspaper *Izvestia* wrote about the *EIR* seminar in Rome, Italy. The headline was “Sabbath at the Hotel Majestic,” the text a classic piece of poison prose: “Outwardly, they in no way looked like cave-men. They were well-dressed, clean-shaven, and their manners were courteous and polite. And the conference hall in the chic Roman Hotel Majestic where they assembled in no way resembled a cave. But all it took was to turn up in that hall and listen to the speeches, and no doubt remained . . . you were among the troglodytes. They came to Rome from various countries, on invitation from a certain Lyndon LaRouche. . . . As the hobbyhorse of his electoral campaign LaRouche has chosen . . . space weaponry. He was delighted with the proposals Reagan made on March 23 of this year, to fill near-Earth space with lasers and other types of ‘total weaponry,’ and now he is sparing no effort in the propaganda of this misanthropic idea.”

Noting the presence at the seminar of prominent military men from several European countries and the United States, *Izvestia* concluded, “The get-together at the Hotel Majestic showed that both Reagan and LaRouche have followers in the Old World.”


On April 2, 1984, the Communist Party daily *Pravda*’s senior commentator, Yuri Zhukov, wrote about an *EIR* seminar on SDI, held in France and addressed by LaRouche. The title was “A Colloquium of Murderers.”

On March 28, 1984, *Literaturnaya Gazeta* printed Aleksandr Sabov’s attack on that same Paris seminar. Sabov branded LaRouche a “neo-fascist.”

Later in April, the *Literaturnaya Gazeta* correspondent confronted LaRouche representatives in Paris, demanding to know LaRouche’s electoral chances, and whether or not he intended to continue his Presidential campaign, announced in September 1983.

LaRouche did campaign, by putting on national television, broadcasts like his Jan. 21, 1984, call for a “National Defense Emergency Mobilization” and, in March, the exposé “Henry Kissinger: Soviet Agent of Influence,” which included the history of MAD vs. the new SDI doctrine. The Soviet attacks on LaRouche became very explicit.

On March 12, 1984, *Izvestia* carried a TASS dispatch titled “One More Scandal.” It demanded that Reagan break with LaRouche: “The White House has been forced to acknowledge the existence of secret ties which the National Security Council (NSC) of the U.S. and the CIA maintain



This widely-circulated book by LaRouche, published in 1980, explained his mutually assured survival strategy for both the United States and Russia, and was one means by which the Soviet leadership knew his alternative and would work, though they rigidly opposed it.

with a neo-fascist organization calling itself the ‘International Caucus of Labor Committees.’ . . .

“The scandalous ties of the Reagan Administration with LaRouche were exposed in a special report on NBC television. Their proofs were so weighty that the White House did not even try to deny them. ‘From time to time,’ mumbled White House official representative L. Speakes, ‘we meet with different people who have information which might be useful to us.’

“A former NSC representative . . . , N. Bailey, spoke about some of these details in an interview with the *Chicago Tribune*. Having said that sometimes he met with LaRouche representatives and that he continues to have ties to the ‘caucus,’ Bailey openly said that the ‘help’ of the LaRouchites is highly useful since ‘they have a fine intelligence network’ . . .

“The acknowledgment by the White House not only exposes the true face of LaRouche but it also shows that the current Washington administration does not shy away from the services of neo-fascist provocateurs.”

Enter Gorbachov

Soviet maneuvers to expunge the influence of LaRouche on U.S. and NATO strategy escalated under the new leader, Mikhail Gorbachov, who came to power as Communist Party chief in April 1985. It was in December 1984, during Gorbachov’s test run to London, that the erstwhile “Iron Lady,” Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, turned into a marshmallow with her comment, “I like Mr. Gorbachov. I think we can do business together.” Thatcher’s conversion to Gorbymania was key to the process of knocking Reagan off the SDI track, and into a series of arms control deals in the framework of MAD, like the Intermediate Nuclear Force (INF) Treaty of

1987.

In the Summer of 1985, the *EIR* Special Report *Global Showdown: The Russian Imperial War Plan for 1988*, with a preface by LaRouche, swept the intelligence community and military leadership circles in NATO countries. It was the first internationally circulated exposé of Gorbachov, as the man hand-picked by Andropov and approved by the Soviet military, to mobilize the Soviet Union and its empire to achieve strategic superiority. *Global Showdown* traced the original scheme for the “*perestroika*” reform to Soviet General Staff strategists of the War Economy. It identified the war mobilization as “the Ogarkov plan,” after ex-Chief of Staff Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov. It explained the driving ideology of the Soviet leadership as the ancient myth that Moscow would be the Third Rome, capital of a final world empire.

Authors of the report presented its findings at press conferences throughout Europe and America. In Turkey, the Soviet Embassy held a press conference for the sole purpose of denouncing a chapter of the report concerning NATO’s Southern Flank.

The year 1986 brought Soviet attacks of ever greater nastiness against LaRouche. The weekly *New Times*, which came out in a dozen languages, published a five-page package about LaRouche on Sept. 5, 1986, titled “Nazism Without the Swastika.”

The Murder of Palme

But first, there was the Palme gambit. Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme was shot to death on a Stockholm street, on Feb. 28, 1986. An international Soviet disinformation campaign began immediately, to blame LaRouche for the murder.

On March 1, Soviet Central Committee member Georgi Arbatov told Swedish correspondents in Moscow: “I do not know who killed Palme, but I know all too well who hated him. I saw demonstrations against him by fascist hooligans. . . . Reaction loathed Palme.” The next day, *Pravda* and *Izvestia* asserted that “right-wing circles,” “Western circles” were behind the hit.

Then, leftist press in Sweden began to report that the European Labor Party in Sweden, associated with LaRouche, was under investigation in the Palme case; this campaign crescendoed with the arrest on March 12 of suspect Victor Gunnarsson, later released, whom the police and press falsely portrayed as a “member” of the ELP.

Once this disinformation was spread all over the world, including by Irwin Suall of the Anti-Defamation League and by NBC television, the Soviets began to play it back. Radio Moscow, *Izvestia*, and the military daily *Red Star* all attributed the assassination to “the right-wing extremist European Labor Party,” or “European Workers’ Party,” as they said. On March 21, 1986, Soviet television’s nightly news program, “*Vremya*,” said about the ELP, “The party headquarters is in the United States. It is headed by a U.S. millionaire, LaRouche.”

The smear campaign to tie LaRouche to the Palme murder

eventually led to a television docu-drama, broadcast in Sweden and in the Soviet Union in early 1987, called “Why Did They Kill Olof Palme?” Here, the assassination was tied to shadowy “neo-fascists,” who were explicitly identified with LaRouche. Over footage of a 1974 ELP demonstration against Palme’s policies, the program quoted Stockholm Police Chief Hans Holmér, “One of the links in the chain of hypotheses is the neo-fascists. Some tracks lead to the European Labor Party.”

Then, a Soviet actor portraying a “neo-fascist” thug spoke: “These gallant lads already in 1974 declared, ‘We will shoot Olof Palme.’ The European Labor Party is already a force, in more than 10 countries; its headquarters is in the U.S.A. Its precise goal is the struggle against communism. Fighting with the reds, they don’t forget about the pinks, too! Listen, to what their leader, LaRouche, says: ‘Palme is a madman. All his words and actions, his speeches in favor of democracy, are hypocrisy. Behind that mask, is a real devil!’ ”

In 1992, a former officer of the East German secret service (Stasi), Dr. Herbert Brehmer, publicly told how he was assigned to initiate the disinformation campaign to blame LaRouche and the ELP for the Palme assassination.

The Palme smear fizzled with the release of Gunnarsson, and LaRouche’s international clout grew in the wake of the March 1986 [Democratic primary election] victories by LaRouche-linked candidates in Illinois. That Summer, a weekly newspaper linked to the newly formed Soviet Culture Fund (a project of Raisa Gorbachova, Armand Hammer, and others) shifted to a new type of coverage.

On Aug. 7, 1986, *Sovetskaya Kultura* suggested that LaRouche could become President by credit card:

“Lyndon LaRouche, a typical American *nouveau riche* businessman, the owner of a large network of financial and credit organizations, . . . got himself suddenly in the center of attention of reporters dealing with the criminal world. . . . First Fidelity Bank is suing him for \$750,000, which LaRouche appropriated for himself in one stroke, using the resources of his financial empire. This money has been transferred to his account by credit card manipulation. . . . All this would not be worth mentioning, were it not for one interesting detail. In recent years, Lyndon LaRouche . . . has wanted to assume the role of a political leader. . . . He even was a candidate for President of the United States. . . . If one U.S. President could get involved in the Watergate scandal . . . why can’t LaRouche manipulate credit cards in the fight? . . . Wouldn’t he try his luck and combine what is profitable—tricks with credit cards—with the fight for the Presidential seat and become a big shot?”

This might sound funny, but the Soviet demand was in deadly earnest.

Sovetskaya Kultura followed up on Sept. 30, 1986. Correspondent A. Sisnev, reporting on how the LaRouche ticket’s Illinois victories “astonished” politicians, endorsed a call in the *Washington Post*, for action against LaRouche. *Sovetskaya Kultura* demanded that LaRouche be removed from



A huge Literaturnaya Gazeta slander of February 1988, called "Yankees and Teutons: The United Neo-Fascist Party of Europe and the U.S.A. Can't Wait To Get Power." Lyndon LaRouche is depicted as a gun-toting Rambo, and Helga Zepp-LaRouche as a German war-goddess, Teutonia.

the political arena. Sisnev wrote:

"For a long time, LaRouche was in the shadows. Then, in the beginning of the 1970s, he appeared on the U.S. political arena as a politician proclaiming himself a friend of the American workers, . . . and of the poor, hungry, and homeless. . . . The notorious International Caucus of Labor Committees emerged, with headquarters in Wiesbaden, and subdivisions in several countries of Europe, Asia, and Latin America. . . .

"The sums which LaRouche and his followers control are kept under very strict secrecy. But the fact alone that LaRouche paid \$3.5 million for his television appearances during the 1984 Presidential election campaign speaks for itself. . . .

"For many people in the U.S., the really concrete question arises: How is it possible that the LaRouchites can act so openly and fearlessly? In this respect, the *Washington Post* wrote, 'Why doesn't anybody ask why the Internal Revenue Service is not interested in the affairs of a man who receives millions of dollars from publications and as contributions, but has not paid any taxes, claiming he doesn't know who pays for his estate in Virginia? Why hasn't anybody clarified, so far, what useful information the administration received from this sheikh of riraff?' . . .

"LaRouche and his followers are zealous supporters of the notorious 'Star Wars' program. . . . LaRouche has declared his candidacy for the 1988 Presidential elections. In a word, LaRouche is now clearly going through a definite period of growth."

That was Sept. 30. Six days later, came the Leesburg raid of Oct. 6, 1986, and then the Reykjavik summit.

Literaturnaya Gazeta of Feb. 3, 1988, at the time of LaRouche's Federal conspiracy trial in Boston, the one that flopped: This article, by Sabov again, is called "Yankees and

Teutons: The United Neo-Fascist Party of Europe and the U.S.A. Can't Wait To Get Power." Lyndon LaRouche is depicted as a gun-toting Rambo, and Helga Zepp-LaRouche as a German war-goddess, Teutonia.

Sabov reported that LaRouche commanded "already around 10%" of the vote in the United States. He wrote that the political action committee founded by LaRouche, the National Democratic Policy Committee, "with lightning speed, infiltrated the Democratic Party of the U.S.A., which was weakened by its failures of the past years" and then racked up the Illinois victories of 1986. NBC-TV called LaRouche a small-time Hitler, said Sabov, and added: "But is it really so small-time, if literally from the beak of the nuclear lobby, knocked together by the 'European Workers Parties' of the Old World and the ultra-right 'Democrats' of the U.S.A., the American administration that is in power today snatched the idea of the 'Strategic Defense Initiative'?"

War-Avoidance

An extraordinary dialogue appeared in *International Affairs*, monthly journal of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs, during 1987. It proves that, during the most lurid Soviet propaganda against LaRouche and the vehement behind-the-scenes demands for his elimination, the idea remained alive within Soviet leading institutions, that they might have to deal with LaRouche on the basis of reality—that is, on the basis of the real content of LaRouche's policies, which was war-avoidance, but with no appeasement or toleration of a Soviet-Russian empire. This is extremely important for the strategic crisis of today, under conditions of a resurgence by the combined forces of the Russian military and elements of the old *nomenklatura*, the ruling elite of the Soviet era.

In the March 1987 issue, *International Affairs* slandered LaRouche in an article by Soviet lawyer activist Vladimir Pustogarov, titled "Neo-Fascism: Weapon of Reaction." Alluding to the alleged "neo-fascist" LaRouche's previous influence on Reagan and his growing influence in general, Pustogarov wildly projected: "Today, there has emerged a new danger, namely, the danger of neo-fascists gaining access to nuclear weapons."

LaRouche sent a long letter-to-the editor of *International Affairs*, and six months later—lo, and behold!—the October issue published LaRouche's letter in full.

The letter stated, "In light of the importance of the AIDS pandemic and eruption of the worst financial collapse in history . . . even should I fail to secure my party's [Presidential] nomination, there is a 70-80% likelihood that I shall be a major influence in shaping U.S. domestic and foreign policies.

"Academician Pustogarov and others may believe that publishing even the wildest fantasies against me is politically sound practice, since I am classed as a prominent political adversary of the Soviet Union. The academician overlooks the small point, on which Marshal Ogarkov might instruct him, that it is the U.S. and U.S.S.R. which are adversaries,

and will probably remain so. . . . Since I am an influential voice among those U.S. figures working consistently for a constructive form of durable war-avoidance between our nations, your journal should think it most counterproductive to frighten Soviet children with the imported, obscene fantasies featured in the identified article.”

The magazine’s editorial presentation of the LaRouche letter sounded two notes. In a short introduction, the editors said, “Had it only been a question of Mr. LaRouche’s squabble with the journal, his letter would not really have been worthy of note. But he touches on some fundamental realities of today, and we therefore print the full text of his letter and our answer to it.”

A different voice came through in the fuller commentary on LaRouche’s letter, appearing after its text, which returned to the hysterical style of the Pustogarov article.

The Soviets knew LaRouche’s war-avoidance principles, from the back-channel contacts during formulation of the SDI. And they knew it from LaRouche’s own writings.

A book-length memorandum by LaRouche, *Why Revival of Strategic Arms Limitation Talks Won’t Stop War*, came out in 1980. It rigorously distinguished true war-avoidance, from arms negotiations carried out under the hegemony of MAD.

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, there were pamphlets such as “Stop the Soviet-U.S. Nuclear Countdown,” and even “A Dialogue with Leonid Brezhnev.” Various Soviet representatives were exposed to LaRouche’s profound insights into the difficulties of statecraft, specific to Russia’s history and culture, which he expounded in “The Failure of Communist Ideology” and “Russian History Briefly, from an American Whig Standpoint.” They knew what he had forecast in *Global Showdown*, namely that an attempt to outstrip the SDI by a brute-force war economy mobilization—without a transformation of culture and economic practice that could not be done under a police state—would quickly bring the Soviet economy to a breaking point, followed by political upheavals.

Therefore LaRouche could say—in his famous war-avoidance proposal for a Food for Peace approach to save Poland and reunify Germany, where he once again outlined how to offer Moscow “a safe route of retreat” and “an escape from the terrible effects of their economic suffering”—in that speech delivered Oct. 12, 1988, at the Kempinski Hotel Bristol in West Berlin: “Moscow regards me with a curious sort of fascination, and, since President Reagan first announced the SDI, considers everything I say on policy matters to be influential, and very credible.”

Soviet leaders were not the only ones aware of LaRouche’s statesmanship. The Soviet slander campaign backfired in a beautiful way, as the young Ukrainian activist Taras Chornovil expressed in a 1991 interview in *EIR*. Asked if he knew of LaRouche, Taras Chornovil replied: “Yes, I have indeed heard of the name, thanks in particular to the

press of the Soviet Union. And to the degree that the Soviet press covered major developments of the West, such as the SDI program, then the name of Lyndon LaRouche was portrayed in a severely negative light. We, however, have learned to read between the lines . . . and we understood that if the name of a political dissident is caricatured in such a very negative way, then the individual must have serious political views. If I remember correctly, Lyndon LaRouche’s SDI program played a very significant role in the earlier years of the Reagan government in providing strong pressure on the Soviet Union and in providing the opportunity for the countries of Eastern Europe to escape from the military boot of the Soviet Union and become democratic nations. . . . I don’t think that the start of the democratic process in the Soviet Union was the result of Gorbachov’s initiatives. He was forced to come to terms with the West. . . . I think that if people in the West view Lyndon LaRouche literally as a political dissident, then it is very sad, because he played an important role in international politics at the time for us Ukrainians. Perhaps the West cannot fully appreciate the impact the doctrine had on us.”

Thus it was a long-term effect of LaRouche’s SDI policy, that many people in the East were prepared to be receptive to LaRouche’s ideas, when it became possible to circulate them there after the fall of the Berlin Wall.

Just three years and ten months after “Yankees and Teutons,” you could read in the Moscow paper *Svobodnoye Slovo*, (*Free Word*), put out by the Democratic Union, a full-page article like this: “LaRouche—The American Dissident.” It was illustrated by a diagram of the Productive Triangle proposal and a picture of a maglev train.

On June 12, 1992, Russians picketed the American Embassy in Moscow. One man held a placard that said: “Freedom for the American political prisoner Lyndon LaRouche and his colleagues.” Also taking part was Valeriya Novodvorskaya, an activist jailed many times under Soviet power, who in 1988 founded Democratic Union, the first party to come into existence in the U.S.S.R. other than the Communist Party.

Ironically, LaRouche today can directly address a far greater number of Russians, while he sits in prison, than he could ten years ago. Such is the power of ideas. Ten thousand copies of his book, *So, You Wish to Learn All About Economics?*, are circulating in Russia. The book came out in English in 1984. The Russian edition was brought out at the very end of last year by the Schiller Institute and the Ukrainian University in Moscow. It was translated by Viktor Petrenko. Prof. Taras Muranivsky, rector of the Ukrainian University in Moscow was the scientific editor for the Russian edition.

This is something to celebrate, for sure.

But the world, in its present perilous condition, needs LaRouche not just via the printed page and by telephone, but in a position to provide guidance “hands on,” starting here in the United States.