
Profile: Rostislav Ulyanovskii

Moscow's man said Gandhi had to go

by Rachel Douglas

One of the old guard of a special department in the Kremlin sounded what turned out to be a deathknell for Indira Gandhi, telling the *Times* of India on Sept. 30, 1984 that the Soviet Union perceived problems with "the strengthening of tendencies for power in one person."

The speaker was Rostislav A. Ulyanovskii, Deputy Chief of the International Department, Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CC CPSU). Since 1966, Ulyanovskii, now 80 years old, has held this post of right-hand man in charge of Third World affairs, to the old Communist International holdover, CC CPSU Secretary Boris Ponomarev. The International Department, headed by Ponomarev and Vadim Zagladin, oversees Soviet relations with so-called "non-ruling parties," which include communist parties abroad, social democratic parties, and diverse movements in the Third World.

Writing in Russian publications, Ulyanovskii appears as a theoretician, to explain tricky points such as how fundamentalist Islam may be "progressive" in Iran, yet "reactionary" in neighboring Afghanistan. As case officer for Third World situations of political interest to Moscow, such as India's internal affairs, Ulyanovskii meets with the relevant parties and puts out the Soviet line of the moment in local publications.

In India, Ulyanovskii met frequently with leaders of the Communist Party of India (CPI) to give marching orders that shifted with kaleidoscopic rapidity, depending on the Soviets' desire to accommodate or to cause trouble for Mrs. Gandhi and the Congress Party. After 1977, when she was out of power and the Soviets embraced the short-lived Janata coalition government, the CPI was hostile to Mrs. Gandhi. Upon her return to power, there commenced a long period of blowing hot and cold, when the CPI's attitude toward her Congress (I) ranged from critical support to, in some cases, collaboration with the Hindu extremist RSS against Mrs. Gandhi's forces.

The Soviets, as usual, were cultivating assets wherever they found them.

In 1982, Ulyanovskii caused a stir with an article he

published in India, which asserted that the Congress Party outweighed any other as a progressive force on the Indian political scene after independence. This was seen as an unprecedented humiliation of the CPI and an overture to Indira Gandhi to form closer ties to the Soviet Union. Two years later, the pendulum had swung back the other way, to the message in Ulyanovskii's Sept. 30 remarks: If Mrs. Gandhi were to disappear, that would be all right.

Meanwhile, an anonymous Soviet staff officer, in an article reported Oct. 28 by the London *Observer*, forecast that a superpower confrontation could soon arise out of tensions on the Indian subcontinent.

The case of Khomeini

In the case of India, to which the Soviet Union claims to be a friend and benefactor, Moscow is cautious about overtly fomenting strife. For public purposes, Moscow propaganda denounces the Sikh separatists and their emigré firebrand, Chauhan Singh, although this "Indian Khomeini" has boasted of his own visits to Tashkent, Soviet Uzbekistan. While Moscow propaganda railed against Chauhan Singh as a CIA operative, Ulyanovskii quietly concurred with him about "the strengthening of tendencies for power in one person."

In the case of Iran, Ulyanovskii was more open. Although the Shah had been welcomed as an honored guest in the U.S.S.R., the Soviets did not have such an image to keep polished as they do in India. Writing in the Moscow weekly *Literaturnaya Gazeta* in June 1983, Ulyanovskii simply chalked up Khomeini's gangs as part of "the Iranian people's anti-imperialist movement, which was gaining in scope under religious slogans. . . ."

The "anti-imperialist" catch-phrase is the giveaway: No matter how oppressive and bloodthirsty a movement is, as long as it has the potential to augment Soviet power in a region, slicing away at that of the United States, it rates as one of the "progressive forces" in the world.

Ulyanovskii attacked the book *Hostage to Khomeini*, written by *EIR*'s Middle East department on the initiative of Lyndon LaRouche. Ulyanovskii wrote: "Illustrating with concrete, real facts the unscrupulousness of Carter's policy in the hostage crisis . . . the author at the same time makes his criticism of the U.S. president so grotesque that it practically goes beyond the limits of credibility. Thus, [co-author] R. Dreyfuss asserts that it was Carter, in collaboration with British Intelligence and the BBC, who helped the coming to power in Iran of 'a gang of cutthroats' headed by the Ayatollah Khomeini, whom he describes without batting an eyelid as a 'profound moral evil' and 'an amoral, vindictive old man, whose perverted model of Islam actually has nothing in common with religion.' . . . Having 'defamed' Carter and above all Khomeini in this way, the author does not omit to pay 'attention' also to the Soviet Union, asserting with reference to 'information from a source,' that the piratic U.S.

air raid into Iran in April 1980 failed because of the 'intervention' of Soviet MiG-21 airplanes."

Not mentioned by Ulyanovskii, but unquestionably a factor in his outburst against *Hostage to Khomeini*, was the chapter of the book that identified the interface between Soviet and British intelligence in the Middle East, in the person and networks of former British intelligence kingpin, now KGB General Kim Philby. The point Ulyanovskii and his bosses would prefer not to draw attention to is that the Soviet Union since the war has acquired extensive assets of British and Nazi intelligence services in the Middle East and South Asia.

Tashkent

How these assets are deployed, through a vast machine of covert operatives, commandoes, priests, party men, and ethnographers, is the subject of the *EIR* Special Report, *How Moscow Plays the Muslim Card in the Middle East* (1983). Ulyanovskii's International Department and the Soviet Academy of Sciences' Orientology Institute, on the board of whose journal sits Ulyanovskii, are in the thick of it.

The Third World section of the International Department descends from the Communist International's July 1920 Baku Congress of Peoples of the East. Dominated by the group known as Islamo-Marxists, the Baku conference charted Comintern policy for the colonial sector, stressing the revolutionary fervor of the East.

Shortly after Baku, the Comintern's Central Asiatic Bureau was set up in Tashkent by the Indian M.N. Roy, a freelance agitator who, before hooking up with the Comintern in Mexico, had co-founded the Mexican Communist Party while on a German intelligence payroll. Roy's Tashkent bureau was succeeded in 1921 by the Moscow-based Eastern Section of the Comintern, the immediate predecessor of Ulyanovskii's office.

In the 1950s, the Soviets turned to the British and Italian Communist parties, in particular, for help in building up the Third World expertise of the International Department and the foreign affairs think-tanks. These parties had great experience in colonial affairs; the British party at times functioned effectively as an arm of the British Foreign Office. Its leading "Third Worldist," a frequent contributor to Soviet journals in the 1950s, was R. Palme Dutt, the half-Indian cousin of Swedish Social Democrat Olof Palme.

Ulyanovskii works through both this Comintern apparatus and the Orientology Institute, whose job is to profile social and cultural developments in the Mideast and Asia with the aim of their optimal exploitation by the U.S.S.R. Based in Moscow, the Soviet orientologists maintain satellite centers in Tashkent and the other Soviet republics of Central Asia. There, as well as to the officially sanctioned Muslim Board in Tashkent, potential friends and troublemakers come from Iran, India, and elsewhere for consultations and training.

Moscow attacks the

by Nancy Spannaus

In the midst of Euromissile deployments, famine in Africa, and a worldwide depression, it hardly seems likely that the Soviet Central Committee would put the matter of birthday celebrations for Friedrich Schiller on their agenda this fall. Yet it seems that that is precisely what they did. There is no

New Times hits the Schiller Institute

The following are excerpts from Vadim Zagladin's article in New Times attacking the Schiller Institute:

Here is a report from the United States.

An organization calling itself Schiller Institute was set up there in August. The list of sponsors includes organizations of the U.S. extreme Right like the American Conservative Union and the Heritage Foundation [sic], and also notorious West German reactionaries.

After consulting the appropriate quarters in Wiesbaden, the founding fathers chose Arlington, a suburb of Washington as the site for the new organization. The choice of name suggests the noblest intentions, but the institute's neo-Nazi, revanchist programme shows that it was an act of sacrilege towards the memory of the great humanist. Europeans? The directors of the new organization dismiss them as "feeble-minded weaklings" for favouring trade with socialist countries. Members of the peace movement? "Traitors ignorant of military matters."

The institute's purpose is to "re-establish the Western alliance on a new, positive basis," that of a "healthy world order" (doesn't this recall Hitler's "New Order"?)

The American interpretation of a "healthy world order" is identical with the content of the "crusade" against socialism, for establishing U.S. world hegemony. And the campaign for such a "world order" provides a sphere of action for the West German Right, with the revanchists at their heels.