

Moscow councilmen ask that LaRouche be freed

The following is the text of an open letter to President Clinton from six members of the Moscow City Council. It is dated July 20, 1993, and was released by council member Viktor A. Kuzin at a Washington press conference on July 29. The six signers were among nine Moscow City Council deputies who, in October 1992, released a political declaration exposing statements by Russian Federation state security officials about alleged contacts of Mr. Clinton with the KGB in his youth, as KGB disinformation; at the time, the Russian government was silent on the matter. Mr. Kuzin is deputy chairman of the Moscow City Council's Committee on Law and Order, Justice, and the Defense of Civil Rights, and chairman of its Subcommittee on the Defense of Civil Rights.

We address you, being a group of deputies of the Moscow Council, who in October 1992 acted decisively to expose slanderous accusations of cooperation with the KGB, made against you—at that time you were a candidate for President of the U.S.A.—by the foreign intelligence service of the Russian Federation.

This crude provocation, which had a very specific goal and was undertaken just a few days before the presidential elections, ultimately failed. We are glad to realize that we did what we could to this end.

We were prompted to act in such a way not only by a natural feeling of appreciation for the decisive moral and political support which the U.S.A. always extended to the human rights defense movement, to the processes of dismantling the totalitarian regime, and the resurrection of a democratic basis for statehood on the territory of the former U.S.S.R., but above all by the firm conviction, that only adherence to civilized norms of political behavior makes it possible to maintain the high moral prestige of democratic institutions and procedures, which are the necessary precondition for the welfare of peoples in general and, in particular, the only source of hope for a better future, for the majority of citizens of Russia.

In the course of developing in ourselves the customs of such conduct, we were always inspired by the lofty ideals of the rights of man, in the formulation and defense of which an outstanding role rightly belongs to the U.S.A.

A special, and in our view key, place among them belongs to intellectual pluralism and tolerance of dissent in all its manifestations. There is no doubt, that it was precisely a political regime based on a traditional respect for these values, that permitted the U.S.A. to become a mighty and flour-

ishing state, and to escape from many dangerous crises and dead ends.

It was therefore with great astonishment that we learned from mass media accounts and official documents, provided in response to our requests by human rights defense organizations, about the persecution, begun under the R. Reagan and G. Bush administrations and continuing to this day, of the prominent opposition figure Lyndon Hermyle LaRouche, who since January 1989 has been serving a 15-year sentence in the federal prison at Rochester, Minnesota, imposed by the court in Alexandria, Virginia.

LaRouche is not a criminal

Having carefully studied the most essential circumstances of the case and data characterizing the public activity and the personality of LaRouche, we are inclined to the opinion, that the real reasons he ended up behind bars have nothing to do with the indictment against him, for fraud in obtaining loans and violation of the tax laws, nor does L. LaRouche himself in any way whatsoever resemble a criminal.

To understand this, it suffices to note even just two lines from the public and political biography of L. LaRouche.

The first is the strategy of world economic development, put forward and given its theoretical foundation by him already in the early 1970s, as an alternative to the approaches of the IMF [International Monetary Fund]. Its goal was to overcome the growing general economic crisis, to overcome the backwardness of the less developed countries, through support for high-technology industry and agriculture in those countries. The second is LaRouche's proposal, in the late 1970s and early 1980s, for joint implementation by the U.S.S.R. and U.S.A. of the idea of a Strategic Defense Initiative, which its author saw not only as a means for guaranteed prevention of the possibility of a nuclear first strike, but also, which is extremely important, as a way "through the machine tool sector, to generate the obvious technological revolution in the civilian economies, not only of the two superpowers, but of other nations around the world—to generate, in short, a global economic boom based on increases of productivity accomplished through increases in investment in technology."

These two original doctrines, which are naturally attractive, put L. LaRouche and his supporters in the center of public attention and made him a real contender for the role of political leader on not only a national, but also a world scale. But at the same time, the first of them (because it ran into a certain conflict with the interests of the IMF) and the second (insofar as it perturbed the U.S.S.R. leadership, because of their fear of exposure of their technological/economic weakness in the area of developing and producing ultra-modern weapons), strange as it may seem, objectively created the preconditions for the persecution of L. LaRouche, both by U.S.A. special services and by the KGB.

Now, published documents leave no doubt about who was the initiator and executor of attacks against L. LaRouche and his supporters, which proceeded especially intensely after March 1986, when two members of the faction he had created inside the Democratic Party won elections in Illinois, and LaRouche himself continued his attempts to run for President of the U.S.A. (the electoral campaigns of 1976, 1980, 1984, and 1988).

We are referring to the recently declassified letter of H. Kissinger, addressed to then-director of the FBI W. Webster, as well as the lie circulated by an agent of the [East German] Stasi on the initiative of the KGB, and picked up by the American and Soviet press, that the LaRouche organization was complicit in the murder of Olof Palme. The circulation of this absurd accusation served as a prelude to the series of officially sanctioned raids by police, FBI agents, and forces of other federal agencies, in October 1986 and April 1987, against publishing companies associated with LaRouche and the offices of firms, which turned them into debtors incapable of paying and led to subsequent bankruptcies. It is typical, that at the very same time, communist propaganda under control of the KGB (F. Burlatsky, Yu. Zhukov, and A. Sabov) actively worked on giving L. LaRouche the reputation of "head of the neo-fascist party," demanding that the U.S.A. administration adopt decisive measures against him.

Justice was abandoned

Esteemed Mr. President!

We are deeply convinced, based on our independent study of the procedural side of the trials of L. LaRouche in 1988 and 1989, and taking into account the highly competent opinion of his lawyer, the former Attorney General of the U.S.A. R. Clark, and of leading jurists and public figures from the U.S.A. and other countries, that the indictment and sentence imposed on L. LaRouche was no act of justice, because it was enacted with gross and repeated violations of elementary procedural norms, which already in and of itself cannot fail to give rise to serious doubts about the quality of the indictment, which there was an attempt to spare from strict judicial review by these means.

Indicative in this regard are the results of the previous trial of L. LaRouche, in Boston in 1988, which ended in a mistrial. The members of the jury stated in the press that they would have rejected all the federal government's accusations against LaRouche, as unfounded and unconvincing. The next time, essentially analogous charges were brought against LaRouche on Oct. 14, 1988 (i.e., only a few weeks before the presidential elections, in which the accused was one of the candidates for President) in Alexandria, Virginia, where government employees were members of the jury, and after the end of the trial, it was discovered that Judge Albert V. Bryan, who sentenced LaRouche to prison on Jan. 27, 1989, had earlier been an attorney for the major private firm Interarms, which dealt in weapons (LaRouche had harshly at-

tacked employees of that firm in public), and subsequently worked on a secret tribunal, connected with the national security of the U.S.A. In the presence of such data, is it possible to speak of independence and impartiality on the part of the jury and of Judge Bryan?!

The details reviewed here, which have long since been public knowledge, in our view show, if not the innocence of LaRouche, then at least the necessity to subject the indictment and sentence to painstaking and strict verification before a Court of Cassation [Appeal]. The Supreme Court of the U.S.A., however, refused this to LaRouche and his lawyer. That is not just rotten justice. That is the abandonment of justice as such.

Mr. President! It is bitter for us to write these lines. But what is happening today around LaRouche and his supporters (two of them, Michael Billington and Rochelle Ascher, were also sentenced to long terms of incarceration—77 years and 10 years, respectively—for analogous charges) in the U.S.A., which is at the summit of its triumph as a superpower, automatically invites just one historical parallel—the trials of the dissidents in the U.S.S.R. from the 1960s to the 1980s. What moved the communist bosses was their understandable fear of losing power. But how can one explain or justify intolerance of dissent today by the U.S.A. administration, whose domestic and international positions are firm as never before? How can one explain such an abrupt departure, in the case of L. LaRouche, from the fundamental values of democracy, for which the U.S.A. continues to agitate around the world? We would not like to think, that the conviction of LaRouche was, even partially, a concession to pressure from the KGB, whose insidiousness you had the chance to experience personally.

Mr. President! We truly believe in the inevitable triumph and high value of a policy based on morality, and we are convinced that you will be able to cut this Gordian knot, break with the heavy heritage of your predecessors in the presidency as concerns the LaRouche case, and ensure the triumph of justice.

It would be unjust, it seems to us, not to take into account the obvious services of LaRouche as the author of the Strategic Defense Initiative, which became so fateful not only for the U.S.A., for also for the entire world.

Today more than ever, it would be shortsighted and even dangerous for the fate of the suddenly monopolar world, with its unpredictably changing face, to undervalue the positive role of an intellectual opposition which carries out the search for and development of non-standard alternative approaches and strategies, directed toward the achievement of global harmony.

Respectfully,

People's Deputies of the Moscow City Council

Viktor Kuzin, Yuri Sedykh-Bondarenko, Valeri Ikishcheli, Aleksei Pogorily, Stanislav Filimonov, Aleksandr Loidis